FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-090
Tuesday
10 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-090

CONTENTS

10 May 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Puts 'Pressure' on NATO Allies, Japan *[Chernyshev]* 1
NATO, Pact Delegates Hold Mandate Talks 1
Karpov Interviewed on Disarmament Issues *[Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS 28 Apr]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Meeting With Amnesty International Previewed 4
Conference on East-West Economic Relations Held 4
International Law Commission Session Opens 4
IMEMO Official on Complex International Scene *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 4
Chinese-Vietnamese Frictions Analyzed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 19]* 7
'International Review' on Disarmament, Conflicts *[Zhukov in PRAVDA 8 May]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reportage on Upcoming Shevardnadze-Shultz Talks 11
  Talks Previewed 11
  Shevardnadze Departs for Geneva 11
Reagan Radio Remarks on INF Ratification Cited *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 11
INF Debate Postponed for 'Indefinite Period' 12
Nitze on Arms Accord Possibilities, Summit 12
U.S. Presummit Sentiments Examined *[Kobysh in IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 12
American Tourist Expelled From USSR *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 29 Apr]* 14
Singapore Names U.S. Envoy Persona Non Grata *[IZVESTIYA 9 May]* 16
Estonians Write Reagan, Gorbachev on Peace 16

China

Reportage on Zakharov Visit to Beijing 17
  Meets Wang Meng *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 17
  Cooperation Agreement Signed 17
  Meets With Li Tieying 17
Zhao Ziyang Receives U.S. Publishers 18

Northeast Asia

Institute Official Hints at Economic Exchange *[Seoul TONG-A ILBO 6 May]* 18
Warships To Visit DPRK Port 12-16 May *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 May]* 18
Dobrynin Sees Off Departing Japanese Communists *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 18
Comparison of Shevardnadze-Itoyama Talks *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 18
Dmitriyev Comments on Asia-Pacific Security 19

Southeast Asia & Pacific

More on Gilashvili-Led Delegation Asian Tour 20
  Meets With Jakarta Officials *[IZVESTIYA 6 May]* 20
  Calls on House Speaker *[Jakarta MERDEKA 3 May]* 21
  News Conference Held *[Jakarta MERDEKA 4 May]* 21

Near East & South Asia

- U.S., Soviet Mideast Aproaches Contrasted 22
- Casualties Reported in Rocket Attack on Kabul 22
- U.S. Urges Afghan Rebels To Continue Civil War *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 23
- Turkestan General on Troop Withdrawal 23
- Indian Spokesman on Gandhi-Najibullah Talks *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 24
  - Further on Delhi Reception *[IZVESTIYA 6 May]* 24
  - Visit Reviewed *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 24
- Maslyukov Receives Afghan Planning Chief *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 25
- King Husayn Receives Special Envoy Sytenko 25
- Jordan, Egypt View Soviet Regional Policy 26
  - Husayn: Constructive, Dynamic *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 26
  - Mubarak: Flexible, Positive *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 26

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Nikanorov Views London Talks on Southern Africa *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 26

East Europe

- Polish Council: Reform Process Irreversible 27
- PZPR Politburo Urges Realism, Responsibility *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 27
- Enterprises 'Working Normally' Except in Gdansk *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 28
  - Further on Situation 28
- Strikes Cause 'Empty Shelves, Endless Lines' *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 29
- Miodowicz on Polish Industrial Unrest *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 29
- Gromyko Departs for Official Visit to Romania 29
  - Ceausescu at Arrival Ceremony 30
- Ceausescu Report on Development Published *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 30
- Demichev Present as Yazov Leaves for Berlin 30
  - Delegation Arrives 30
- CSSR Leaders Greet Soviets on Victory Day *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 30
  - Reciprocal Message *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 31
  - Murakhovskiy Marks Jubilee *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 32
- Leadership Greets GDR on 'Liberation' Jubilee *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 32
  - GDR Return Message *[PRAVDA 8 May]* 33
  - Koenig Holds Reception *[East Berlin ADN]* 33
  - Koenig Addresses Soviets 34
- Further on AUCCTU's Shalayev's SFRY Talks *[TRUD 5 May]* 34
  - Further on Krunic Meeting 35
  - Visit Assessed *[TRUD 9 May]* 35

West Europe

- Nuclear Factor Influences Danish Elections 36
- UK Role in Wartime Murmansk Convoys Recalled *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 36
- Mitterrand Elected President of French Republic 36
  - Gorbachev Congratulations *[PRAVDA 10 May]* 36
  - Rightist 'Ideology' Defeated *[PRAVDA 10 May]* 37
  - 'Total Victory' Achieved *[IZVESTIYA 10 May]* 38
- CPSU Delegation Returns From West Berlin *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 39
- West Berlin Mayor Cited on 'National Capital' *[PRAVDA 10 May]* 39
- EEC Flag in West Berlin Violates Agreement *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 39
- Italian Communist Delegation Visits Soviet Union *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 40
- Italian Company To Supply Ads for Soviet TV *[Rome ANSA]* 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Grigoryants, Others Placed Under Arrest *[DPA]* 41
    Dissidents Criticize Arrest *[AFP]* 41
Article Lashes Dissidents' 'Cologne Appeal' *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 4 May]* 41
Zaykov Addresses Moscow Rayon Leaders *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Apr]* 42
Government Appointments, Reassignments Noted *[SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR: OTDEL PERVYY Nos 11-14]* 43
Academy of Sciences Restores Bukharin's Title 43
Azberbaijan Floods Cause R7 Million Damage *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 44
Banned Estonian Flag Shown in Tallin Parade *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 4 May]* 44
Lithuanian Writer Views Nationalities Issues *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Apr]* 45
Participants View Conference on Religion *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 4 May]* 47
Trawlermen Fined for Illegal Far East Fishing *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 4 May]* 48
Availability of Churbanov Book Protested *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 7 May]* 48
Publishing Statistics Released on Press Day 48
New Soviet Literary Journal Editor Interviewed *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 48
Kiev Reader Bemoans Local Press Footdragging *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 51
'Democracy' Program on Press, Restructuring 52
Conference of Prosecutor's Office Aides Held *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 May]* 55
Legal Expert on 'Presumption of Innocence' *[PRAVDA 3 May]* 56
'Dictatorship of Proletariat' Call Derided *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 58
Past Secrecy Over 'Afghan Drama' Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 9 May]* 59
Paper Defends Ukrainian Kolkhoz Chairman *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 3 May]* 61
Briefs 65
    Book on Youth Issues 65
    New Estonian Party Organ 65

Economic

Politburo Approves Estonian Management Plan *[Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 30 Apr]* 65
Conference Urged To Revise State Enterprise Law *[MOSCOW NEWS No 16]* 66
Briefs 67
    Siberian Oil Output 67

Scientific

Further on Activities Aboard 'Mir' Complex 67
    Photographs Taken 67
Progress Recorded on Cold Nuclear Fusion *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 68
Leaders Sign Obituary of Mathematician *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 68
Briefs 68
    Solar Power Station 68
    Antarctic Activities 68

Military

Events, Articles Celebrate 43d Victory Day 69
    Minute of Silence Observed 69
    Solovyev Attends Ceremony 69
    Shcherbitskiy Lays Wreath 69
    Yazov on Legacy of War *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 69
    Kulikov on War's Lessons *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 May]* 73
    Akhromeyev Reviews Conflict 75

U.S. Puts 'Pressure' on NATO Allies, Japan

LD0605210688 Moscow TASS in English
2057 GMT 6 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The U.S. Administration has brought pressure on its allies in NATO and on Japan to compel them to step up their military expenditures.

Various measures have been employed. They range from demands in the U.S. Congress, couched in expressions that are far from very polite, to courteous but strict reprimand of allies for stinginess, contained in an official Pentagon report. William Taft, U.S. deputy secretary of defense, arrived in Europe to inform the public of NATO countries of the state of affairs in this area and to cite examples from the history of Rome to convince the allies that they will have to loosen the purse-strings to provide the money for the implementation of the U.S. plans for the preparation for war, to increase their military budgets by one-third in the next decade. The problem of military expenditures of the United States allies has already become one of the main subjects of the debates in the canvassing campaign in the USA.

The culmination of the first stage of pressure on the United States European allies in Nato and on Tokyo has been the speech that U.S. Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci delivered at the New York Foreign Policy Association on the redistribution of the burden of military expenditures within NATO. Rebuking U.S. congressmen for unambiguous threats to NATO countries and Japan, the Pentagon's chief, nevertheless, remained recalcitrant in his demand for the build up of the military expenditures of the United States allies. Many of our allies can and must contribute more, Carlucci said.

He emphasized particularly the lag in the rates of the build up of military spending of Japan, the United States main rival at international market. The speaker singled out the Land of the Rising Sun and tiny Luxembourg among those whose contribution by almost all standards is far from commensurate with their economic might. Britain and France are among the front rankers commended by the Pentagon's chief. France, incidentally, is not even an official member of NATO's military structure.

What is the cause of Washington's new noisy campaign for the increase of the military spending of the United States' allies? Naturally, it is not the growth of the "military menace" on which Pentagon speculated so much in the past.

The matter is that the U.S. Administration, apparently, has not abandoned the hopes of achieving military supremacy over the USSR. Washington now intends to draw heavier on the financial resources of its allies for the purpose. The economic factors, too, have played a certain role. The United States is clearly striving to compel its allies, above all Japan, to shoulder a heavier burden of the military expenditures, and thus to weaken their competitiveness in the world market.

If Washington were really concerned over an inequitable sharing out of the military expenditures, the United States could remedy the situation by lowering its own military appropriations to, say, the average level in NATO. An even more effective road to the settling of the question of military expenditures is to widen the number of agreements on arms control, also on military budgets.

A foreign policy course based on common sense, on sober appraisal of the situation in the world, on new political thinking is apparently needed to adopt such decisions.

NATO, Pact Delegates Hold Mandate Talks

LD0905114288 Moscow TASS in English
1131 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Vienna May 9 TASS—Representatives of Warsaw Treaty and NATO member countries met here today for consultations to draft a mandate for future talks on reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

They stated the coincidence of the positions of the sides on a number of issues pertaining to the organisation and procedure of the future talks.

Karpov Interviewed on Disarmament Issues

PM0905091288 Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS in Portuguese 28 Apr 88 p 12

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov by Luis Delgado; date and place not given]

[Excerpt] [Introductory passage omitted] DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Mr Ambassador, do you confirm that the START Treaty will not be ready in time for the Moscow summit?

Viktor Karpov: There is a Latin saying that goes: "While there is life, there is hope." So while I live, I hope. However, realistically speaking, it is unlikely that the signing of the treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic missiles will take place at this summit.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: What are the major obstacles?

Viktor Karpov: The most important problem has to do with observance of the ABM Treaty. At the Washington summit in December Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev agreed that the ABM Treaty should be strictly observed for a certain period of time. So far it has not been possible to achieve that aim, and all our attempts to turn that understanding into a juridical agreement have been unsuccessful.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: But Secretary of State George Shultz said at a press conference in Moscow a few days ago that the problem of space weapons, implicitly linked to the ABM Treaty, had already been resolved....

Viktor Karpov: That is the problem. We have repeatedly heard George Shultz say that the United States is prepared to carry out its part of that understanding, but nothing of the sort is happening. Only in February Shultz stated that the understanding between the United States and the USSR on that matter was a "Bible," of which not a word could be changed. Despite that, the U.S. delegation in Geneva is proposing something else—replacing the current ABM Treaty, on which we must reach agreement, with a new treaty which will make possible all kinds of research and tests in the strategic defense sphere.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Is that the only problem preventing the conclusion of the START Treaty?

Viktor Karpov: There are other problems—specifically with the cruise missiles deployed at sea and in the air—but they are less important than the ABM issue.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Could only a new U.S. president surmount these disagreements?

Viktor Karpov: I hope so. A 50-percent reduction of strategic missiles suits the security interests of the USSR and the United States, and all U.S. presidential candidates—both in the Republican Party and the Democratic Party—assert that they will continue those efforts.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: But it has been easier to negotiate with President Reagan, which initially seemed impossible. How do you explain this understanding with a man who created the image of being a "hard-liner" with respect to Moscow?

Viktor Karpov: This can be explained by the combination of objective factors which operate regardless of the wishes of those who are in power at a certain moment. That is, it is a matter of reaching a level of cooperation between the two states on matters as vital as these which will suit both sides' interests. The fact that President Reagan reached the White House with an overtly anti-Soviet stance did not prevent him from realizing the need to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: That also had to do with the new Soviet leader....

Viktor Karpov: Yes, I must say that the USSR leadership also changed many of its attitudes toward the United States. We began a policy of greater openness, and that made it possible for our relationship to be based on greater mutual knowledge and on the realization that the USSR's policy is consistent in words and deeds.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Since the START Treaty will not be ready for the Moscow summit, will a declaration or agreement similar to that initialed in Vladivostok by Brezhnev and Ford be signed?

Viktor Karpov: More than that. I believe that the points which have already been agreed in the Geneva talks can be turned into an agreement which could serve as a basis for future talks.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: The hypothesis of a fifth summit between Reagan and Gorbachev, also this year, just for the signing of the SALT Treaty, has been suggested. Is that possible?

Viktor Karpov: We have not yet discussed this with President Reagan.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: The Moscow summit will center almost exclusively on regional conflicts, which is an unusual agenda for such meetings. What significance do you attach to this?

Viktor Karpov: It cannot be said that the summit will be devoted essentially to regional conflicts. We will be analyzing Soviet-American relations as a whole. We will broach bilateral, regional, and disarmament topics.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Only in the disarmament field will a document or statement be signed, however...

Viktor Karpov: This is an agreement for the continuation of talks on a 50-percent cut in strategic weapons. The summit will be very useful because it will solve other problems and must be regarded as a stage in the development of USSR-U.S. relations.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Do you not believe that the importance of summit meetings is diminishing?

Viktor Karpov: At every summit new issues are broached that help to improve relations between the two countries, so even if there are no spectacular results these meetings are very important.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: The USSR has accused NATO of increasing its military strength. Do you not consider it legitimate for the Atlantic alliance to try to compensate for its conventional disadvantage with respect to the Warsaw Pact?

Viktor Karpov: Not at all. The theory behind NATO's rearmament policy is false.

The theory that the Warsaw Pact has a vast supremacy over the alliance countries is groundless. In this connection we have already proposed to the United States and the other NATO countries the simultaneous publication of all information on the armed forces and conventional weapons of the United States, the USSR, NATO, and the

Warsaw Pact. This should be done by each individual country and region. This proposal was repeated by Minister Shevardnadze during his visit to Lisbon.

NATO responded negatively to this specific proposal. Clearly this comparison of facts will dispel the myth of the Soviet Union's military superiority.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: London's Higher Institute of Strategic Studies has indicated this imbalance in its annual report, however...

Viktor Karpov: The London Institute's data indicate more or less 3.2 million military personnel for NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The London Institute does not say that the USSR has a vast superiority....

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: The recent NATO summit in Brussels issued a specific proposal to the Warsaw Pact for an accord on conventional weapons. The USSR has not yet said anything about it....

Viktor Karpov: We have not received any official proposal from NATO. We are currently discussing conventional weapons reduction with all NATO countries in the Vienna negotiations. So the Atlantic alliance's proposal makes sense. [sentence as published] In any case, they must reply to our proposals....

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: These negotiations have been dragging on for years....

Viktor Karpov: They have been going on for precisely 1 and 1/2 years and lie within the context of the Helsinki process. The main purpose is to reach an agreement on the agenda for the talks on the reduction of armed forces and weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals. The Warsaw Pact countries have put forward their proposals and we are merely awaiting NATO's reply.

Our proposal is fairly simple: If asymmetries exist we are willing to eliminate them. In a second stage we are willing to reduce armed forces and weapons to levels that would rule out offensive actions, in other words, to maintain a military capability solely for defensive purposes.

DIARIO DE NOTICIAS: Mr Ambassador, I put this same question to Paul Nitze and Max Kampelman: Is it difficult to negotiate disarmament issues with the Americans?

Viktor Karpov: As negotiators, the Americans are very serious but also petty. I have known Paul Nitze since 1969: He knows how to defend his viewpoints well, is well informed, and knows what he wants. I too know what he wants, however....

Meeting With Amnesty International Previewed

LD0705130588 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 7 May 88

[Text] It was announced in Moscow that the first ever meeting between Soviet representatives and Amnesty International will take place in Paris next week. This country has been a frequent target of strong attacks by the London-based human rights watchdog, so Nikolay Gorshkov, what do you expect from this particular meeting?

[Gorshkov] Although there appears to be no specific agenda for the Paris meeting, it may be viewed as part of our restructuring policies, aimed at more openness in discussing topical issues and more cooperation with all parties concerned in solving those issues. It is no coincidence that the discussion with Amnesty International will take place on the eve of the Soviet-American consultations on human rights, also to be held in Paris. But whereas the Soviet-American consultations are between officials, Amnesty International will meet the Soviet Public Commission on Human Rights, headed by a prominent journalist, Fedor Burlatskiy. The commission has just ended its regular session in Moscow, where it has put forward several far-reaching initiatives. The commission has proposed to establish a soviet constitutional court to guarantee that all Soviet laws are in conformity with the country's constitution. Fedor Burlatskiy has told journalists that all the members of his commission supported a proposed new law to protect religious freedoms. Mikhail Gorbachev referred to the drafting of this law in his meeting with Patriarch Pimen, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Soviet lawmakers are in constant consultations with the church leaders and the Soviet human rights commission on the subject, and I think this is likely to be part of the agenda for the Paris meeting with Amnesty International.

Conference on East-West Economic Relations Held

LD0905152188 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Berlin May 9 TASS—What will economic relations between Eastern and Western countries be at the turn of the new millennium? Experts from 16 socialist and capitalist states are trying to give an answer to this question. They attend a conference, to last many days, which opened in the capital of the GDR today. The forum was initiated by the Vienna Institute of International Economic Analysis and the Central Institute of Economic Sciences of the GDR Academy of Sciences.

Opening the conference, director of the Vienna Institute Gerhard Fink noted that the frank exchange of opinions between economists did not interrupt in the years of international tension. It became one of the important factors of establishing the atmosphere of confidence in East-West relations which to still greater extent now determines the political climate of the planet.

International Law Commission Session Opens

LD0905192588 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Geneva May 9 TASS—The 40th session of the International Law Commission, with 34 prominent international jurists taking part, opened at the Geneva Palace of Nations today.

"Today when the foundations of a non-violent world are being laid, the role and significance of international law as an instrument of peace and security of nations is growing," Professor Yu.G. Barsegov of the USSR, who is taking part in the session, said in a TASS interview. "Therefore," he stressed, "the current session has a great practical significance."

The session of the International Law Commission will continue till July 29.

IMEMO Official on Complex International Scene

PM0905082988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with O.N. Bykov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, by S. Chugrov, deputy chief editor of MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA: "New Thinking and Old Stereotypes"; date and place not given—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Hopes and fears, confidence in the future, and doubts—these sentiments are now closely interwoven in the consciousness of everyone in the world. Surely there can be no indifference here. How well founded are the optimists' hopes? How real are the skeptics' doubts? Is it possible to predict the future course of disarmament? These questions formed the theme of a conversation which IZVESTIYA requested between S. Chugrov, deputy chief editor of MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, and O.N. Bykov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations [IMEMO].

[Chugrov] Oleg Nikolayevich, last August IZVESTIYA printed a roundup under the rubric "Your Opinion." Then people passing by the Pushkin monument were asked about the prospects for the signing of a Soviet-U.S. treaty on abolishing intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Only one of those questioned expressed confidence that an accord would be reached. The others were skeptical. Nevertheless, at the beginning of December, the treaty was signed, and that passerby proved to be prescient. This incident is perhaps not the most indicative. Nevertheless, it is symptomatic, I think. Does this mean that our public opinion is "lagging behind" the rapid changes taking place in the world and that it is becoming difficult to make quite accurate predictions?

[Bykov] Maybe, although I do not think that this question is absolutely correct. What actually was predicted? In politics, trends are predicted. But the signing of treaties should be regarded as an event. It is far harder to predict events. Here, of course, stereotypes often predominate, stereotypes which have become deeply rooted in people's consciousness. This is a simple extrapolation from what was typical in the past.

[Chugrov] Could you explain what you mean?

[Bykov] For example, the struggle for disarmament which was waged for decades very regrettably could not escape from the realm of propaganda to the realm of practical decisions. It took the achievement of nuclear parity and tremendous political efforts by both sides to initiate the phase of real disarmament. But not only that: It was also necessary for the U.S. side to show an understanding of the need for disarmament. It also took time and strength to overcome the stereotypes of the cold war period. Partial arms limitation measures were achieved with great effort.

[Chugrov] But then the arms race began to gain the upper hand, and the development of military technology outpaced the talks... The military-industrial complex and militarism seemed to people to be a force which could not be combatted....

[Bykov] Of course it is not easy to overcome that psychological barrier. But it is also necessary to see the other trends which work in the opposite direction, which restrain militarism, and which proceed objectively from the impossibility of a military solution of the problems dividing us.

There is something that must be borne in mind here. We have made great progress in the atmosphere of glasnost and in the realistic analysis of our domestic processes. In the sphere of foreign policy and international relations, however, (and this point must also be made!) our ideas about events are still slow to free themselves from a single-track, oversimplified, nondialectical approach.

We often cannot see the interconnected development of opposite tendencies and take things out of context. Is there a military-industrial complex?

[Chugrov] Of course there is.

[Bykov] Is it powerful?

[Chugrov] Of course.

[Bykov] And, therefore, there is militarism, too?

[Chugrov] Undoubtedly.

[Bykov] Nevertheless, one must not focus one's attention solely on it or paint a picture of the West in a single color and fail to see the complex interplay of different vectors in a new and radically different situation. The truly scientific methodology creatively developed by our party in the past 3 years makes it possible to comprehensively evaluate this situation today. A truly conceptual breakthrough has occurred in the consideration of the realities of the modern world.

Why did the passersby on Pushkin Square so uniformly put forward the standard view of events? Probably this is really because our social consciousness is lagging behind the changes in international life. We need to learn how to think in the new way.

[Chugrov] And the professional forecasters?

[Bykov] Yes. Scholars of international affairs and representatives of our mass media. Without them, for example, there would be no answer to a very serious question facing us: Can capitalism survive without militarism?

But it seems to me that the transition to new thinking can take place very quickly. Judge for yourself: There is the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles; there is the political settlement on Afghanistan.... These realities are part of our life.

[Chugrov] That is, there is already an actual process of abandonment of the old stereotyped perceptions and former schemes, and of the desire to paint everything in black and white....

[Bykov] ...Of the principle: "Everything is either good or bad." That is why it is so annoying to see and hear the hackneyed, stereotyped assessments that are still typical of some of our observers. Commentaries still often use two main colors when depicting the West: on the one hand, a negative portrayal of anything to do with the official U.S. line, and on the other, demonstrators carrying placards. This is not a true reflection of reality. There are different trends and conflicting opinions in official Washington, too.

[Chugrov] As I see it, we often overlook this aspect.

[Bykov] Precisely. And when—"suddenly"—a Soviet-American treaty is signed, there is total confusion: "How can it be?"

[Chugrov] Our usual explanation is: "under pressure from public opinion."

[Bykov] Public opinion is an influential force. We sometimes forget that we have one here, a very powerful one at that. It is more varied than has seemed in the past, and it is learning and absorbing all that is new. But it is also exercising a considerable influence on politics.

The Western antiwar movement certainly should not be depicted in an oversimplified, standardized way, either.... It must not be reduced to a banality: "Upsurge of the antinuclear movement... Passionate antimilitarist sentiments... Under pressure from the peace-loving public...." It is all much more complex than that. The upsurge of the antinuclear movement took place at the time when NATO was deciding to deploy U.S. missiles, and its decline began after they were stationed on European soil.

[Chugrov] It is necessary to portray the real development of events, not the development you want to see.

[Bykov] That is, the objective state of affairs. I am sure that in the present contradictory but interdependent world, there exists a common denominator for security, the common denominator the West, the East, and the whole world now needs. Finding a precise political, let alone legal, treaty expression for it is very hard. For example, in Reykjavik they did not manage to come to an agreement, but it was clear that they had key interests in the security sphere profoundly in common.

[Chugrov] It is on recognition of this commonality that our political thinking is based. Otherwise, what would there be to talk about? But what has changed in recent years? There was "pressure from public opinion" in the United States before. Our desire for peace remains unchanged, too.

[Bykov] Obviously, the situation has changed. There is now an awareness of all aspects of strategic parity and that a nuclear conflict would be disastrous. There is a more realistic approach by the U.S. side to the security problem. But our side has also revised its traditional approaches, which were not contributing to the achievement of accords.

[Chugrov] For example?

[Bykov] We used to weigh strategic equilibrium as if on an apothecary's scales. Disarmament was seen in terms of "chopping off" an absolutely identical number of armaments from each side. There were examples of unwarranted rigidity and inadequate flexibility in our understanding of how it is possible to "exchange" quantity and quality and other components of the strategic equation in order to reach agreements. We have now gotten through to the point where we can see that equilibrium consists of an asymmetry of qualitative and quantitative factors.

There is, of course, something else that must not be overlooked. Each one of our proposals came up against fierce resistance by militarist forces in the West. A role was played by events which pushed back the disarmament process. No matter from what viewpoint you assess the situation around Afghanistan, objectively speaking, it sharply complicated Soviet-U.S. relations and was exploited by those who had no desire for disarmament. Nor should we forget the Reagan administration's attempt to climb to a new level of military might and the sharp and insulting attacks against us. This is a reality which must be borne in mind.

[Chugrov] Indeed, the U.S. President called our country an "evil empire" on several occasions in the early eighties. His stance seemed to be implacable. But the second half of our decade became the time of unprecedentedly active Soviet-U.S. ties. It seems as if the President himself is amazed by this. What caused such a mutation? Or have there been any serious changes in the administration's views? Or have we changed substantially?

[Bykov] I don't think it worthwhile to appraise the situation in "either/or" terms. The grammatical conjunction "and" would be more appropriate here: Both the one and the other! In the United States, there has been a change in the correlation of the factors which we discussed. Of course, what could be described as "post-April" foreign policy has emerged in our own country.

We may be still insufficiently well aware of the tremendous positive influence which our domestic changes—restructuring, glasnost—have had in the West. Maybe those passersby in Pushkin Square whom IZVESTIYA interviewed have still not realized that the whole world is watching our every step with keen interest. To be honest, in the past we repeated rather too often that "all peace-loving mankind ardently approves the Soviet proposals, ...ordinary people all over the world wholly and fully support...," and so on. We often repeated it, but actually we did not believe all our words. We knew that there were some points on which the "progressive public" in the West did not support us. We knew, for example, that those same "ordinary people" could not understand why we were in Afghanistan. It was possible, by skillfully juggling all sorts of different facts, to present us in an unseemly light before a rather broad public.

And how about now? What profound, positive changes restructuring has made to the West's ideas about the Soviet Union! Substantive changes have occurred in our foreign policy, and not only in terms of form or style. There has also been a change in the "image" of our country, which was perceived as a bogey by the West in the past.

We obviously underestimate the tremendous contribution we ourselves have made to the improvement of the world situation. This contribution is actual, real, not the contribution "for the record" which was made by our propaganda at the time when we divided the world into "militarists" and the "overwhelming majority" which supported us.

[Chugrov] But now we can feel the effect of inertia of thinking, kinds of conditional reflexes which hinder our correct perception of our changes. How about U.S. public opinion? Has it rejected the old stereotypes about the Soviet Union? You were in Washington at the time the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed. What impression of the public mood did you get from contacts with Americans?

[Bykov] There have undoubtedly been the most profound changes in the public mood, and actually among really broad strata of the population. The overwhelming majority of people in the United States are in favor of disarmament—specifically in favor of the treaty signed in Washington—as well as a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, improvement in relations with us, and a new summit meeting.

[Chugrov] But I don't think there is any point in going to the other extreme and assuming that there has been a transformation of public opinion at all diametrically opposed levels. Stereotypes are tenacious and deep-rooted. The demolition of stereotypes is a painful and contradictory process, especially when talking about the higher echelons of power in Washington. In a recent speech in Springfield, the President made a series of attacks against the Soviet Union, strove to lecture us, and almost demanded that the internal order in the USSR be changed. Why? Is it only because it is very difficult to eradicate stereotypes?

[Bykov] It would be an unforgivable simplification to consider them nothing more than false ideas. Stereotypes are present in official statements not because the President or his speechwriters have failed to overcome them. These symbols represent certain definite interests, such as the ultraright-wing forces and the military-industrial complex. Militarism is in no way an abstract phenomenon but a perfectly tangible material force.

[Chugrov] The position of different vectors obviously produces the resulting line which determines the direction of foreign policy course. Could you, therefore, play the role of an "oracle" and outline the chances for the signing of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms? Let me remind you that this question is similar to the one asked of passersby near the Pushkin monument when IZVESTIYA interviewed them last fall.

[Bykov] I would not like to be an oracle. It has already been said that it is difficult to predict events. What can be said? Both the Americans and we objectively need a deep reduction in strategic offensive arms. It is also correct that there are still questions which have not been resolved. But they are primarily of a practical, military-technical nature and are perfectly capable of being resolved. Specialists from both sides now agree that, given mutual political will, it would be possible to reach agreement and sign the document. The domestic contradictions of U.S. policy make a prediction more difficult. It is an arena for a struggle between two trends which could be figuratively described as "militarist" and "moderate." Their balance is extremely complex and changes according to the domestic U.S. situation, the development of international relations, changes within NATO, and so on. Nonetheless, there is a realistic opportunity for substantial progress toward real disarmament, improving Soviet-U.S. relations, and strengthening international security.

Chinese-Vietnamese Frictions Analyzed

PM1005084588 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 19, 7-13 May (Signed to Press 5 May 88) pp 4-5

[Article by Ye. Sevastyanov in response to reader's letter: "Vietnam Will Complete Troop Withdrawal From Cambodia in 1990: PRC-SRV: Overcoming the Period of Estrangement"—first two paragraphs comprise reader's letter]

[Text] "Please tell us about the current state of Vietnamese-Chinese relations.

"R. Pogorelskiy, Gorkiy."

The Chinese and Vietnamese peoples have lived as neighbors for many centuries. The history of their relations is varied. There have been periods when the two contiguous states have lived in peace and accord. But there have been others when the Chinese emperors mounted raids on their southern neighbor and seized its land.

Revolutionary stormclouds spread over Asia at the end of World War II. China and the northern part of Vietnam embarked on the path of socialism. A bright new era in relations between the two countries seemed to be opening up. Indeed, the foundations for cooperation began to be laid. Their friendship was tested not just by peace but by war and was tempered, in particular, in the struggle against American imperialism and the anticommunist aggression launched in Southeast Asia in the sixties.

Victory was eventually won. The Yankees retreated, and in 1976, Vietnam was united—the Socialist Republic of Vietnam was founded. But it was precisely during this period favorable to the development of ties that Chinese-Vietnamese relations began to show cracks. Contradictions began to pile up on top of one other. The PRC, still undergoing the lamentable "Cultural Revolution," and Vietnam held different views on the Soviet Union and had different approaches to the United States. Friction was also caused by Chinese emigration to Vietnam.

Object of the Dispute—the Cambodian Issue [subhead]

The abscess that had developed in relations between the two countries burst open in Cambodia. There Pol Pot and his followers had swept to power on the wave of revolution in 1975. Intoxicated by the ideas of the "Cultural Revolution," they put their own people on the rack while mounting acts of provocation against neighboring Vietnam and making territorial claims on it. In 1979, Pol Pot and his stooges were swept from the political arena by the genuinely revolutionary forces of Cambodia, who were helped by Vietnamese volunteers. Beijing responded by mounting an armed assault on the northern regions of Vietnam, seeking to "teach Vietnam a lesson." The operation failed, but from that moment, PRC-SRV relations drastically deteriorated and remain difficult to this day.

True, diplomatic contacts are maintained; the Vietnamese Embassy functions in Beijing, and the Chinese Embassy likewise in Hanoi. However, the Chinese side states that there "can be no question" of normalizing PRC-SRV relations until the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. As for Vietnam, since 1982, it has annually carried out a partial withdrawal of its volunteers from Cambodia and has stated that it will complete their withdrawal in 1990. Hanoi supports the PRK leadership's line of national reconciliation, talks with opposition forces, and the formation of a coalition government to build a peaceful, independent, democratic, neutral, and nonaligned Cambodia.

At the same time, the SRV proposes opening bilateral dialogue with the PRC aimed at settling the disputes. Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, has expressed his readiness to begin talks with the Chinese side any time, anywhere, and at any level. The SRV Government regularly submits proposals to the PRC designed to normalize the situation on their joint border, particularly as the new lunar year approaches so that the inhabitants of both counties may celebrate this great festival in tranquility.

As a rule, the PRC adopts a negative attitute to Vietnamese initiatives and proposals. The recently finished session of parliament (National People's Congress) in Beijing again accused the SRV of "lacking in sincerity." China continues to make efforts to exert political pressure on the SRV at the United Nations and provides extensive material aid to Cambodian antigovernment groupings, particularly Pol Pot and his followers. Beijing states that Soviet-Chinese relations cannot be fully normalized either until the Soviet Union brings influence to bear on Vietnamese policy in Cambodia.

The Ownership of the Islands [subhead]

Another irritant in PRC-SRV relations has assumed prominence recently. On 21 February this year, a representative of the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry stated that Chinese warships intruded into Vietnamese territorial waters in the region of the Spratly Islands on 31 January. The Vietnamese Foreign Ministry demanded such action cease and confirmed Vietnamese sovereignty over the Spratly and also the Paracel Islands, situated in the South China Sea.

The Vietnamese side issued another statement on 15 March, pointing out that Chinese warships had fired on SRV cargo ships the day before in the region of the Spratly archipelago. The Chinese Government made countercharges against Vietnam and stressed that China exercises "indisputable sovereignty" over the islands in question.

Thus we have here a dispute, and one which is made worse by the fact that some of the islands, which are of important strategic and economic significance, are also claimed by certain other Asian states, including Malaysia and the Philippines. In this complicated situation, Vietnam proposed to China that talks be held to settle the disputed border problems by political means. To date the PRC has not agreed, considering sovereignty of the islands not to be a matter of discussion.

It should be noted that China's actions in the region of the Spratly archipelago have evoked a clear-cut reaction in Asia. Abdoelgani, political adviser to Indonesian President Suharto, opined in an article in the INDONESIAN OBSERVER that the PRC "is creating new tension which could undermine stability and peace." From the standpoint of Singh, director of the Indian Institute of Defense Studies and Analysis, the advance of the Chinese fleet toward the Spratly Islands is preparation for its "penetration" into the Indian Ocean. Some commentators note that Vietnam has for a long time now exercised sovereignty over a number of the Spratly Islands and that this archipelago lies alongside Vietnamese territory and at a considereable distance from Chinese territory.

The PRC has not to date responded to SRV initiatives designed to reduce tension in the border zone. Reports claiming "new armed incursions into PRC territory by the SRV" have been circulating in the Chinese capital since the end of last year. The Vietnamese Government describes such reports as "groundless."

The Soviet Stance [subhead]

Thus there are quite a few problems existing between the PRC and the SRV. How, then, can they be resolved?

M.S. Gorbachev has stressed in this regard the Soviet Union's interest in ensuring that "comradely dialogue be resumed and unnecessary suspicions and mistrust be removed" between these two Asian socialist states. The Soviet Union supports Vietnam's constructive stance on a political settlement of the border problems with the PRC. It is important to show restraint here and prevent actions capable of further complicating the situation in Southeast Asia.

The Chinese leadership has repeatedly stressed that it advocates a peaceful solution of all international disputes. The coincidence of the SRV and PRC stances on this question and the fact that both neighboring countries are engaged in building for a peaceful future and a search for ways of improving socialism inspire hope that the period of estrangement in Chinese-Vietnamese relations will eventually be overcome. Everyone who holds dear the peace and security of the peoples of Asia has an interest in such a prospect coming to pass.

'International Review' on Disarmament, Conflicts

PM0905151588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[Yuriy Zhukov International Review: "The World Last Week"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] The Peoples' Will Cannot Be Ignored [subhead]

It is no exaggeration to say that the vast majority of mankind now advocates speedier progress along the path of arms reduction and the elimination of the means of mass destruction. States' leaders cannot disregard that fact.

It is no coincidence that, for example, the conference in Duesseldorf last week between the foreign ministers of the 12 EEC states and the 6 ASEAN countries which discussed problems of economic ties between those regional organizations still considered it necessary to speak in favor of prolonging the disarmament process which began with the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, universal banning of chemical weapons, and solving regional conflicts through talks.

A similar stance was adopted during talks last Thursday between FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and Japanese Prime Minister N. Takeshita, who stressed the need to make use of the impetus given by the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles to the achievement of further process in disarmament.

In this context, foreign observers are wondering what political ideas the U.S. President will bring with him to the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. Analyzing his numerous public statements recently, those observers maintain that arms reduction questions have clearly been pushed into the background as though Washington had lost interest in them. For example, they cite the following facts:

Since the previous meeting in Washington, certain progress has been achieved in the discussion of the question of the 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments. The hope was expressed that a treaty to that effect would be signed in Moscow. However, the talks in Geneva, where work on the treaty was being conducted, have slowed down lately.

What is the reason for the unexpected delay in the examination of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles in the U.S. Senate? Especially after the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, having discussed it comprehensively and at length, recommended its ratification? Meanwhile, as THE NEW YORK TIMES stressed in an editorial 2 days ago, "if the Senate does not approve the treaty before the Reagan-Gorbachev summit, such an event will probably not happen under Reagan's Presidency—and perhaps it will not happen at all (!)."

The point is also being made that the discussion of the question on banning and eliminating chemical weapons at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, whose latest session ended last week, has not advanced by a single step.

The United States' clear loss of interest in the solution of disarmament questions is causing concern to its allies, who prefer detente to confrontation. In the middle of last week, for example, A. Dregger, chairman of the Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union parliamentary group, left Bonn for Washington. He gave President Reagan a personal message from FRG Chancellor Kohl which, according to the West German DPA news agency, "expressed the hope that the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will be followed up by a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments." "It is reported," the agency added, "that the FRG chancellor also supports the global banning of chemical weapons, the elimination of the inequality in the conventional arms sphere, and a verified reduction in the tactical nuclear missile sphere to identical upper limits."

The situation is somewhat better with the development of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations, on which an accord was reached earlier. For example, last Monday in Washington, two important documents were signed on Soviet and U.S. scientists' joint work in the sphere of space. At the same time, the seventh Soviet-U.S. joint commission on cooperation in the use of nuclear energy was being held. A memorandum was signed on cooperation in the sphere of civilian nuclear reactor safety. Cultural ties are continuing to develop successfully. Contacts between individuals are expanding. Of course, one should not underestimate the significance of the now regular diplomatic consultations between representatives of the two countries' foreign policy departments on questions of bilateral relations and on international problems.

But none of this, of course, can replace the question of how the U.S. side intends to proceed in resolving the truly vital problems of ending the dangerous arms race. Let us hope that the talks between the USSR Foreign minister and the U.S. Secretary of State, due in the near future—the last such meeting before the Moscow summit—will shed some light on that important question.

Time To Douse the Fire of Regional Conflicts [subhead]

[Passage omitted] Attention was also drawn to the 2-day meeting in London last week between representatives of

Angola, Cuba, South Africa, and the United States. That meeting, which took a long time to prepare, began the discussion of the question of ending the hostilities waged against Angola by South African troops and Savimbi's South African-armed antigovernment gangs which have invaded that country. At the same time, the meeting is examining the question of granting long-awaited independence to Namibia, Angola's long-suffering neighbor, which South Africa is unlawfully keeping under its sway. South Africa's troops carry out their raids on Angola from Namibian territory.

The participants in the London meeting have published a joint statement to the effect that progress has been achieved during the talks and that in the near future those talks will be resumed in an African country. Such a development of events can only be welcomed as a sign of a realistic approach to settling local conficts by means of talks. One cannot but be alarmed, however, at the gloomy warning in Britain's THE TIMES that "the prospect for a solution of the problems under discussion remains very remote."

President P. Botha of South Africa, according to BBC television, "has made a statement in which he let it be known that there should be no undue optimism on the possible results of the present meeting." A BBC commentator set out Botha's position in the following terms: "For the time being at least, South Africa has no intention of leaving Namibia, because its territory is rich in natural resources of vital importance to the West."

What is this? It is a long time since we last heard such frank talk in a 19th century colonialist vein: If you are rich in natural resources, so much the worse for you because I shall take them! But we are not in the 19th century—we are on the verge of the 21st, a fact which should not be forgotten by the South African racist ringleader or by his transatlantic protectors. They should understand that the time has gone forever when they could seize other people's lands with impunity and keep them by force.

Relations between countries can now be built only on the basis of the recognition of each people's freedom to choose its own fate. The schemes of those who refuse to understand this and who still rely on violence will sooner or later fail.

Instead of obstructing the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts, would it not be more sensible for the whole world to set to work and begin the search for realistic solutions based on rational compromises, solutions which may not be easy but which are vitally important? Tempus fugit!

United States & Canada

Reportage on Upcoming Shevardnadze-Shultz Talks

Talks Previewed

LD1005115888 Moscow TASS in English
1150 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

A regular meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze, foreign minister of the USSR, and George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, opens in Geneva on May 11. This will be the 26th meeting since September 1985 when the heads of the foreign policy departments met for the first time in Washington to prepare the first meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, which took place in Geneva in November 1985.

Since then the Soviet-U.S. talks at the foreign minister level became traditional and are held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

It will be recalled that as a result of the Geneva meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz on November 23-24, 1987 efforts succeeded to get agreement on the last issues, which remained unsettled until then, concerning the drafting of the treaty on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. This allowed the signing of the treaty during the visit of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to the United States.

The 26th meeting of the ministers, opening in Geneva tomorrow, will become, to all appearances, the last before the visit of the U.S. President to Moscow, which is scheduled for May 29-June 2. During the previous meeting of the ministers in Moscow (April 21-22) the sides managed to identify specific opportunities for further movement ahead in all areas of the relationship by the time of the summit meeting, and also agreed that the top-level meeting in Moscow should become the next important stage on the way towards more stable and fruitful mutual relations.

During the talks in Moscow the sides confirmed firm commitment to take intensive efforts to complete the elaboration of a treaty on slashing and limiting strategic offensive armaments and all documents related to it within the shortest possible time-frame. Exactly such efforts are needed now to overcome the remaining disagreements.

Shevardnadze Departs for Geneva

LD1005113388 Moscow TASS in English
1118 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, left Moscow for Geneva today to meet U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

At the airport, Shevardnadze was seen off by member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR Anatoliy Kovalev and other officials.

The send-off party also included the ambassador of Switzerland to the USSR, Francis Pianca.

Reagan Radio Remarks on INF Ratification Cited

PM0905115688 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "President R. Reagan's Radio Broadcast"]

[Text] Washington, 8 May—President Reagan delivered his routine radio address on Saturday; it was entirely devoted to next week's commencement of the discussion in the full Senate of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. "The treaty is a remarkable, historic achievement," the President stated. "Its implementation will make it possible to eliminate an entire class of American and Soviet nuclear missiles. It is a reliable treaty, drawn up in the course of thorough talks, a treaty that strengthens the security of our country as well as of our allies in Europe and Asia." At the same time the idea that talks with the Soviet Union must only be conducted "from a position of strength" could again be heard in the address by the head of the U.S. Administration.

"I know the Americans resolutely support the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles," R. Reagan went on. "The House of Representatives has already come out in support of the treaty by an overwhelming majority—393 votes to 7." The President called on the senators to embark without delay on the discussion of the document and expressed the hope that the Senate will consent to the treaty's ratification as a "historic step along the path to a more secure world." The Senate's approval of the treaty, he pointed out, will make it possible to embark on the elimination of nuclear missiles and put into action the monitoring system for which the treaty makes provision.

A number of senators have recently expressed "concern" over the problem of the so-called "arms of the future." A few days ago Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, stated that the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles will not be submitted for discussion by the full

Senate at least until 11 May, referring to "problems over the arms of the future" that affect the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The question of these arms will be additionally examined in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence next Monday and Tuesday.

INF Debate Postponed for 'Indefinite Period'

LD1005070788 Moscow TASS in English
1010 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Washington May 10 TASS—Robert Byrd, the Democratic majority leader in the U.S. Senate, has put off the beginning of the INF Treaty ratification debate for an indefinite period.

Byrd told reporters on Monday that not only the earlier revealed problems had not been resolved, but new ones had developed.

Robert Dole, the Republican minority leader, agreed with such a decision.

"There simply has not been a meeting of minds on verification problems," Senator David Boren, head of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, said explaining the Senate's decision.

According to him, the forthcoming regular meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. Secretary of State would give a chance of resolving the issues, which are putting off the debate, before the Moscow summit.

The White House official spokesman refused to comment on the Senate's decision on Monday, but emphasized that the INF Treaty deserved ratification.

Nitze on Arms Accord Possibilities, Summit

LD0905211188 Moscow TASS in English
2052 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Washington May 9 TASS—An agreement between the USA and the USSR on strategic offensive armaments could be signed at the forthcoming Moscow summit meeting, but it is difficult to give definite guarantees of that. This was stated here today by Paul Nitze, special adviser to the President and secretary of state on arms control.

In an interview to the USIA Worldnet he has said that strenuous efforts are being exerted for that to become possible. But the remaining problems are still numerous and difficult and, he said, he cannot predict that the work over the treaty on strategic offensive armaments would be completed in time for the summit meeting. He has repeated that strenuous efforts are being exerted to bring about that possibility, but success cannot be guaranteed.

Answering the question of a possibility of concluding a treaty on strategic offensive armaments by the end of the year, the U.S. expert said that attempts would be made to do so, if the treaty was not concluded in time for the summit meeting. Paul Nitze said that in his opinion the Treaty on Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles would be ratified by the U.S. Senate. He said he would be surprised if the treaty did not get the Senate's approval before the President's trip to Moscow.

U.S. Presummit Sentiments Examined

LD1005133388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 May 88 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Vitaliy Kobysh "Political Observer's Opinion": "Getting Ready To Pay a Visit"]

[Text] Very soon—to be more precise, in 3 weeks' time—the U.S. President is to arrive in the Soviet Union on his first visit. Reports have appeared that, inter alia, the CIA is preparing a half-hour movie for him which says everything about us. Of course, snide political commentators have not managed to resist the temptation to remind people that R. Reagan intends to crown his term in office with a visit to the country which he did not regard with very much favor at the beginning of his Presidency.

In keeping with a proverb—shun the one who drags up the past (people at the White House now value highly Russian proverbs, which is the chief reason why I cite it)—we endeavor not to rake over the past. We think more about the future, about creating a climate in Soviet-U.S. relations in which past insults and misunderstanding, not to mention suspicion and fear, will dissolve. We are doing everything to ensure that this meeting, the fourth now, between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the head of the Washington administration produces real, weighty results for our peoples and for the cause of peace as a whole.

To use R. Reagan's expression, "it takes two to tango." Quite right. But for this very reason we could expect the U.S. side to share our efforts to prepare for not just a ceremonial but a profitable meeting. Alas. It has already been reported that on the question of signing a treaty on strategic offensive arms, in particular, the White House has clearly backtracked from what it was saying during the Washington summit meeting. Well, a free man may do as he likes (this, too, is for the connoisseurs of Russian folklore in the U.S. capital), although this proverb in itself does not explain everything....

The U.S. Senate's protracted examination of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, signed in Washington, is also a cause of surprise, to put it somewhat more delicately. Surprise, because, as U.S. senators assert, by its awkward and ill considered action the administration has itself created difficulties on the way to ratifying this treaty which undoubtedly suits everyone (or almost everyone) with its timeliness and necessary nature.

I will say bluntly: From my viewpoint the preparations for the visit, if one is to approach it seriously and see it filled with real deeds, are being conducted in Washington somehow strangely. However, that is Washington's affair and concern, and it is up to Washington to look into this. I probably would not touch on all this if it were not for something else.

In preparing for the visit, people in the U.S. capital seem to have confused what is theirs and what is not theirs at all. And they have begun taking an interest not so much in their own as in our exclusively internal affairs, for some reason having taken on not their own but our concerns.

I have already had occasion to speak about R. Reagan's bellicose statements calling for confrontation, particularly his Springfield speech on Soviet-U.S. relations. The attacks on our country by the head of the White House have been duly assessed. Did the lesson not find its mark? For the attention of observers of glasnost in the USSR: I will now say something unusual, which has not been said before in this regard! The lesson did find its mark.

I have before me the text of another speech which R. Reagan has just delivered, this time in Chicago, at the "National Strategy Forum." I read it and cannot believe my eyes. Quite a different tone and different words, very frequently really conciliatory ones. As though someone else had said all this. Here is the truth: Learning is light, while lack of learning is darkness (this is for the folklorists). And yet.

I would very much like to do without these "and yets." But how can I ignore such passages from the President's new speech: "...The Soviets seem to be coming to understand something of the connection—the necessary and inextricable connection—between human rights and economic growth." Or this: "The Soviets should recognize basic human rights because it is the right thing to do." And how could I overlook this: "...Glasnost—today's new candor—will succeed if the Soviets take steps to make it permanent, to institutionalize it."

Impressive, is it not? President Reagan is a fighter for glasnost, democratization, and restructuring. "The Soviets" have only to follow the White House's instructions, and all will be in order. In what "order"? Not, I am afraid, the order we seek.

We criticize ourselves mercilessly: The purpose is to improve our system and make it more efficient and humane. As regards criticism from the other side, from across the ocean, its purpose will not delude us. So, while being very grateful to R. Reagan for his advice to "the Soviets," we nonetheless state with regret that little has changed in U.S. policy with regard both to socialism as a whole and to the Soviet Union in particular.

That this is so is confirmed by the recently-published report of the presidential consultative commission on questions of so-called public diplomacy, which consists chiefly of ultraright-wingers. Here is just one, very topical extract from that report. "In the sphere of propaganda support for the preparation and holding of the upcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting in Moscow the report contains the following recommendations:

"—Public diplomacy (read—propaganda, for the most part anti-Soviet—V.K.) must be regarded as one of the top-priority strategic elements in the sphere of planning the summit meeting....

"—An all-embracing and coordinated strategy in the sphere of public diplomacy for the Moscow summit meeting must be drawn up at the highest level in the White House, the State Department, and the USIA."

Let us not be deluded. The recent speeches by both R. Reagan and other leaders of the Washington administration are not delivered just like that. They are part, as the aforementioned report states, of the "priority strategic elements in the sphere of the planned summit meeting."

The roles have been allocated. After venturing unfriendly statements with regard to the USSR in a number of speeches, in his Chicago speech the U.S. President flattered us, as it were, praising us for glasnost and giving "the Soviets" instructions to "recognize basic human rights because it is the right thing to do." At the same time, most likely under the same general schedule, Secretary of State G. Shultz declares that certain modest improvements have occurred in the sphere of human rights in the Soviet Union but that Moscow has still not done enough. And at a briefing in connection with the publication of the seventh (!) Pentagon yearbook "Soviet Military Power: An Assessment of the Threat," U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci ventured to completely distort the USSR's general course, our policy, and the essence of Soviet military doctrine. "We have not yet seen," F. Carlucci declared, "any effect of restructuring on the military establishment, and this is clearly stated in the book.... This book clearly shows that their doctrine is offensive. It could be called the 'first strike,' or it could be called something else...." And in an interview with the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, the selfsame U.S. defense secretary became quite emotional: "The Russians invariably arm themselves, and the degree of modernization is horrible."

Such words. It is hard to even believe that they come from the lips of such a, on the whole, moderate man as F. Carlucci was hitherto considered to be. They seem to be pronounced by someone else, who has organized not very proper games around the U.S. President's upcoming visit to the Soviet Union. These "someones" are evidently very strong in the United States if even R. Reagan, for whom the trip to the USSR has been reported to have special significance, is participating in these games which undercut in advance the value of the visit.

There must be clarity. Yes, the Soviet people are renowned for their hospitality. But also for the sense of their own dignity.

American Tourist Expelled From USSR

AU0905121388 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 29 Apr 88 p 3

[Report by Yu. Ovsyannikov, PRAVDA UKRAINY special correspondent, Vinnitsa-Kiev: "'Mister Amerisov' Has Left Ahead of Time...—Story of an Exposed Visitor. He Did Not Mind Presenting Himself as a 'Friend' of the Soviet People, But Actually He Stepped Onto Our Soil, as They Say, Nursing a Grievance"—boldface as published]

[Text] **This happened a few days ago. I happened to "come into contact" with a visitor from Chicago. He was Alex (Aleksandr Zakharovich) Gendler, former inhabitant of Vinnitsa. When he was 20 years of age, he left the Soviet Union... Well, the roads to the USSR are open, even for those who turned their backs on the homeland some time ago.**

Generally speaking, we host scores of foreign visitors, as is known. They have an opportunity to familiarize themselves in detail with the life of the Land of the Soviets, and this promotes the cause of strengthening mutual understanding and the useful contacts among peoples.

However, we have to point out that some people in the West endeavor to use the growing stream of foreign visitors, the cordiality and openness of the Soviet people, for ignoble purposes.

"...In view of your illicit activities, which were manifested in the disregard for the interests of the Soviet state and for the legal rights of Soviet citizens, the decision was made to expel you from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Militia Lieutenant Colonel V.F. Zaselyan, chief of the Visa and Registration Department of Vinnitsa Oblast Internal Affairs Administration, read the text of the decision and handed it over to its "addressee" who was sitting opposite. Indeed, this was the very same U.S. citizen, A. Gendler.

That stocky, brawny fellow, dressed casually (a sweater, a cowboy hat, blue jeans, and jogging shoes), unhurriedly pulled out his glasses and became absorbed in the document. And at this point his calm and confidence failed him again. As had happened during his previous conversation with journalists—correspondents of VINNYTSKA PRAVDA, Ukrainian television, and myself—Gendler resorted to quick-tempered attacks and remarks.

He meticulously went into whether he had been treated correctly. He did not fail to recall, for example, that his visa was in order and still valid.

"That is right. But you are to be expelled. In accordance with the law on the legal status of foreign citizens in the USSR, in this case, a visa loses its validity," Vasiliy Fedoseyevich Zaselyan explained.

The questions were over. In the end, Gendler also tried to accuse the correspondents who were present in the office of prejudice, hurling a reproach at us: "Here they are, the journalists that cooperate with the authorities!"

What can one say, Alex' rage was consistent. Apparently, he would have liked the journalists—and not only the journalists—to "raise objections."

Having considered the essence of the circumstances connected with Gendler's tour (and he spent a total of nearly 4 months in our various cities) one can see that with programmed obstinacy, this visitor sought here and there to find "oppositionists" to the authorities, to our way of life, to the entire Soviet system.

One can understand the feeling of indignation which took possession of Lyudmila Bayda, for example, an inhabitant of Vinnitsa, soon after her meeting and conversation with Gendler.

Some time in the past, they had been acquainted. The visiting gentleman tried to take advantage of it. To start with, he pretended to be a "friend," a person who, on the whole, sympathizes with our economic reform, with restructuring.

But soon it turned out that the words of "sympathy" were only needed to find out how far his interlocutor was receptive to frenzied anti-Sovietism. L. Bayda spoke with indignation about how the intriguer had sought to turn her into an accomplice in blackening the socialist system, in slanderous fabrications that opposed the leading role of the Communist Party.

This was Gendler's "trade mark." Something clearly perceptible in the behavior of this man was the will of his overseas bosses... However, should one believe the "traveler"—that he was absolutely independent, and that his entire trip was quite private, and paid for with his own money.

At this point, perhaps, the time has come to make a brief excursion to Alex Gendler's overseas household. Having left for Israel in 1974, soon after he turned up in the United States. There he settled down and began his performance in the field of journalism.

What favorable winds moved him? Most likely, an answer to this question lies in his pronouncement about the destinies of immigrants in the United States: "What happens with immigrants varies. Some do badly; others are well off... A great deal depends on one's luck, one's age, and on the opinion one held about the Soviet system before leaving the USSR."

Judging by Alex' tale about how he fared in America, his "opinions" about the USSR met with a favorable reception in certain circles and scored, as they say, an "OK" mark. In the States that "opinion-maker" took a determined place in the mass media. He allegedly works as a chief radio commentator, and belongs to a group of experts on the problems of American-Soviet relations.

"My material is not only intended for radio," he said. "I also contribute to seven American newspapers. In addition, I publish a thin monthly bulletin, AMERICAN-SOVIET REVIEW."

"Thus, the name of journalist Gendler seems to be rather well known in America?"

"I use the pen-name Alexander Amerisov: 'Amerisov'—an abbreviation for 'American-Soviet'."

An interesting pen-name, is it not? The hyphen in this name could have been interpreted as a symbol of a good, linking bridge, in the interest of cooperation between the United States and the USSR. Alas, this has proved to be a mark of separation....

Let us have another look at the "trade mark" used by "Amerisov" while in our country. We remember how he skillfully manipulated "small facts" in a conversation with us, and how, as if in passing, he jeered at some difficulties experienced in the Soviet Union.

In principle, this is an old method used by our class adversaries. They take any vital problem (and we do not conceal these; we persistently and openly settle them) and present it as if it had been detected by their own "fact finder".... I think Gendler realized that the Soviet people were able to rebuff psychological attacks.

And now let us have a look at his tour in some detail. In the first stage of the voyage, late in 1987 and early in 1988, it took him nearly a month to make an individual, tourist trip along the Uzhgorod-Vinnitsa-Odessa-Moscow route.

Then he got a 3-month guest [gostevaya] visa in order "to stay with his mother." But actually his own mother was not honored with any of her son's attention. Instead, he did not mind spending a month in the company, as he said, of "various unofficial people [neformaly] and democratic socialists in Moscow."

Such tendentious interest was not accidental. After all, it is no secret that Western special services are now sweating with all their might to use the processes of glasnost and restructuring for their subversive purposes in the USSR. The enemies are dreaming of creating a multiparty system of a bourgeois type and the so-called "free trade unions" in our country and, in a refined way, are inspiring the unlawful activity of some spontaneously formed bodies.

It is characteristic that Gendler showed particular interest, for example, in the chauvinistic shouters from the notorious "Pamyat." True enough, during a conversation in the Visa and Residence Department, Gendler, as if taking additional precautions, mentioned that "Pamyat" was not an association "to my taste."

Is it really not, Mr. Alex? In its own way, precisely this "taste" is close to you and your sponsors. After all, the "Pamyat" bosses say that the revolution in Russia was a result of a "Jewish-Masonic conspiracy," and in this way repeat the "ideological theses" adhered to by the "Black Hundred," Kolchak, Denikin, and Makhno. Thus, it turns out that the Zionists should rejoice at the existence of "Pamyat." They expect a double advantage: There is an opportunity to raise an outcry about "state anti-Semitism" in the USSR and, at the same time, to divert attention from the real, wild outburst of anti-Semitism in the States.

According to data published by an American public organization, the Antidefamation League, in the United States the number of unbridled sallies against ethnic Jews in 1987—from the desecration of cemeteries and synagogues, to arson and physical violence—totaled 1,018.

In this context, there is every ground to suppose that Gendler and his collected "USSR material" was impatiently awaited by hysterical Zionists, "news industry" bosses, and analysts in the special services. And the "tourist" did his best. He did his best, in particular, to concoct reports ordered, as he said, by a NEW YORK TIMES deputy editor with whom he was acquainted.

"If I had only had 3 weeks of (tourist—Yu. O.) time and if I had left immediately, I would have left you in a bad mood," Gendler admitted candidly. "But then my moods evened out and improved significantly."

What was it, then, that improved his moods so significantly?

As if it were some kind of drug, the traveler cheered himself up with brawls in public places, and with scandalous incidents he provoked himself. Just consider the shameless tricks he used in the Odessa synagogue.

In the messages they addressed to the official authorized by the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers for religious affairs in Odessa Oblast, citizens I.P. Strashinskiy, A.D. Litvan, L.M. Goldenberg, and A.M. Grigoryev expressed their deep indignation at the overseas visitor's misbehavior.

Here is an excerpt from L.M. Goldenberg's declaration: "Having introduced himself as an American radio journalist, Alex Gendler made unheard-of complaints about Soviet Jews. He encroached upon the Soviet citizen's dignity; he repeated that rights and freedoms were nonexistent in the USSR. That journalist blamed members of our community for the fact that the synagogue did not fight against the state authorities. He said that he would reveal all this in accusatory articles published in America. I feel offended by the behavior of this foreigner. There is no room for such people in the USSR."

And here is an excerpt from I.P. Strashinskiy's declaration: "While in the synagogue, Gendler abused the religious, Soviet Jews. He said that we were a kind of inferior race, and shouted that the Jews belonging to our community did not participate in demonstrations against the state authorities. His intention was to humiliate us.... I request that we be protected from such hooligan-like visitors in the future."

This was how he behaved in Odessa. The "well-wishing" journalist seemed to be willing to get to know the local religious Jews better, but it was immediately obvious that his objective was to collect biased information; he urged his hosts to commit illegal acts.

As a matter of fact, although Gendler did not shun disguise, always and everywhere he showed himself to be an individual with procured and rehearsed anti-Soviet schemes, intended to discredit and undermine socialist values.

Of course, the patience of the Soviet people has its limits. No one—and least of all an exposed hooligan-like slanderer—is allowed to abuse our hospitality.

What is "Amerisov" now doing in America? Is he, maybe, just putting the promised "masterpieces" into circulation?

He also took care to make a serial, video film. For example, in Tulchin (Vinnitsa Oblast) no matter what happened, he specialized in turning his camera on heaps of trash, old buildings, and waste dumps.

When A.I. Kulesh, a worker in the Tulchin combine of the municipal enterprises, tried to moderate this hunter of trash still-life ("it is improper for a visitor to be fascinated only by such things"), Gendler responded with a tirade about the "oppression" suffered by the Soviet people who, he said, had "no idea either about freedom or about democracy."

But what "freedoms" did Gendler bemoan? Were they not the very same freedoms which are commonplace in the States, with its millions of citizens condemned to wander freely to labor exchanges, with the FBI freely hounding American peace fighters, and with a true expanse of heartlessness and violence?

"People like Gendler harbor a grudge. They do not want Soviet-American relations to strengthen, they want to hinder them by any means," is the opinion of Anton Ivanovich Kulesh.

He was absolutely right.

"Mister Amerisov" has left ahead of time.... The news about this, I presume, will be used by some people in the United States to ring the bell of anti-Sovietism even more zealously in order to welcome home the expelled instigator as a hero.

But we would like to hope that sober-minded Americans are in an overwhelming majority. And they will receive Gendler's unattractive story as a lesson.

Singapore Names U.S. Envoy Persona Non Grata

LD0905152788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Told To Leave the Country"]

[Text] London, 8 May—The Singapore Government has declared U.S. Embassy First Secretary Mason Hendrickson persona non grata and demanded that he leave the country. A published government statement accuses the American diplomat, Reuter reports, of interfering in Singapore's internal affairs.

Estonians Write Reagan, Gorbachev on Peace

LD0905130888 Moscow TASS in English
1238 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Tallinn May 9 TASS—TASS correspondent Velu Huva reports:

"In the Second World War the Soviet and American peoples were allies, and united for the fight against fascism and defeated it. Time has come now to join forces again to save the world from the nuclear threat," says an address to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States. The address was adopted today by the participants in the V-Day festival who gathered on Tallinn's song field.

Soviet people, the document points out, are interested in a resultative summit meeting. They are confident that the Soviet side does everything for the summit to justify all aspirations connected with it.

The address conveys hope that the U.S. side, too, will reckon with the reality and will take the partners' interests and its responsibility to the world into consideration.

"The political climate today has undoubtedly softened. Soviet people, just like millions of Americans, are advocates of pursuing a policy of disarmament through trust. Thousands of proponents of people's diplomacy from our countries consistently destroy the enemy-image stereotype which was once imposed by cold war. We rejoice at meetings with one another", says the address by the participants in the festival on Tallinn's song field.

Over here, Estonia's largest-scale activities—song festivals—are held every five years. The tradition originated way back in 1869. Concerts draw up to 30,000 singers who perform before 150,000 spectators. Peace campaigners, among them war veterans, young people, and members of various professions gathered on the field today for a spring festival and to mark the holiday of victory in the Great Patriotic War.

Restructuring of the entire life in the Soviet Union is noticeable at today's folk festival as well: There are no official meetings. All people came here on their own accord to stay together, to talk to acquaintances, and to listen to stories related by participants in the war and to performances by favorite singers, brass bands or ensembles.

"I think today's festival is the result of positive changes in our country", said Arnold Meri, chairman of the Estonian Friendship Society. "Giving up over-organised meetings and rallies will attract more young people to active movement for peace. Today young people feel freely and are aware of great responsibilty for themselves and for the destiny of others. I watched with interest with what enthusiasm they regarded the adopted address to Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan".

Arnold Meri pointed out that Soviet people and Americans solidarise in the main thing: A desire to change the world for the better and to get rid of the threat of nuclear war. He voiced confidence that the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow would lead to new steps along the road of strengthening peace and security on earth.

China

Reportage on Zakharov Visit to Beijing

Meets Wang Meng

PM0905110588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] Beijing, 3 May—An exchange of opinions has begun here between V.G. Zakharov, USSR minister of culture, who is in the PRC on an official visit, and Wang Meng, Chinese minister of culture.

The two sides briefed one another on the progress of the far-reaching transformations in the cultural sphere in the USSR and the PRC. After a frank, detailed discussion of the problems arising on this path, the ministers noted the similarity between a number of tasks facing cultural and arts figures in the two countries at the present stage. They stressed that an exchange of experience and information in this sphere will be of mutual benefit.

During the conversation, they expressed the mutual desire to further develop Soviet-Chinese cultural ties.

Cooperation Agreement Signed

LD0405174388 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 4 May 88

[Text] Beijing May 4 TASS—An inter-governmental plan of bilateral cultural cooperation for 1988-1990, signed here today, provides for the development of friendly ties between the Soviet and Chinese peoples.

In keeping with the agreement, the State Kuban Cossacks' Choir, the Bolshoy Ballet and the Soviet Circus School will perform in China.

Soviet audiences will familiarise themselves with the Orchestra of Chinese National Musical Instruments of the National Song and Dance Ensemble, with original works of Chinese graphic and applied art.

Contacts have been established between major cultural educational and special educational establishments in the two countries, including the State Hermitage Museum and Beijing's Gugung Museum, between the State Museum of Arts of the Peoples of the Orient and the History Museum of the city of Xian, between libraries and conservatoires in the two countries.

The USSR and China will jointly release records and tapes with national music recordings and continue exchanges of delegations between corresponding unions and societies of creative workers.

The plan was signed by Soviet Minister of Culture Vasiliy Zakharov and Chinese Minister of Culture Wang Meng. The ceremony was attended by the Soviet ambassador to China, Oleg Troyanovskiy.

Meets With Li Tieying

LD1005095988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Beijing, 10 May (TASS)—PRC State Council member Li Tieying has met with USSR Minister of Culture Vasiliy Zakharov, who is here. They exchanged information about the progress of socialist construction in the two countries and the deep transformations in the cultural, social, and other spheres of public life which are taking place in the Soviet Union and the PRC.

The sides valued highly the importance of the bilateral intergovernmental plan for cultural cooperation for the years 1988-90, which was signed a few days ago in Beijing. The conviction was expressed that the development of Soviet-Chinese cultural ties and also of relations in other spheres is in accordance with the interests of the peoples of the two countries.

Zhao Ziyang Receives U.S. Publishers

LD0705133888 Moscow TASS in English 1308 GMT 7 May 88

[Text] Beijing May 7 TASS—At present there are two problems in Sino-U.S. relations: The U.S. stand on the Taiwan issue and the restrictions on the transfer of advanced technology to China, said Zhao Ziyang, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee. He met with a group of American publishers currently on a visit here. Albeit the USA regards China to be a non-aligned and friendly nation, he noted, discrimination is yet practised against it in the field of transfer of technology. Moreover, statements by some U.S. Congressmen are, as a matter of fact, interference in China's home affairs and an insult to the sentiments of the Chinese people.

Sino-U.S. relations, Zao Ziyang said, should be built proceeding from the interests of "peace and development" and cannot be directed against third countries, failing which, he noted, these ties will be unstable, temporary. The Chinese leader voiced hope for a stable and healthy development of relations between the PRC and the USA.

Touching upon the Taiwan issue, Zhao Ziyang noted a broadening of contacts between Taiwan and Continental China and a considerable increase in non-direct trade between them. The Chinese Communist leader said that China would continue the policy of reform and broadening of foreign ties.

Northeast Asia

Institute Official Hints at Economic Exchange

SK0605094588 Seoul TONG-A ILBO in Korean 6 May 88 p 1

[Tokyo-YONHAP report]

[Text] On 5 May, Yevgeniy Primakov, director of a Soviet institute dealing with world economics and international affairs, a foreign policy think tank for the Gorbachev regime, declared that the Soviet Union is willing to have economic exchanges with any country, including Korea.

In an interview with the Japanese paper YOMIURI SHIMBUN on 6 May, Primakov, who is to participate as an observer representing the Soviet Union in the sixth meeting of the Pacific (?Basin) Economic Community [PBEC] scheduled to be held in Osaka, Japan, on 17 May, stated that "the Soviet Union will also participate in the Seoul Olympics" and then stressed that "we have no prejudice of any kind toward any country."

Responding to a question on what he thinks about economic cooperation with Korea, a member of the PBEC, Primakov said: At the same time, we have to take into consideration the stand of North Korea, a Soviet ally, as a matter of course.

Noting that one of the main objectives behind the all-embracing economic reforms and the economic perestroyka in the USSR is to accelerate economic development in the Far East and East Siberian regions, he explained that the Soviet Union will lay stress on developing the Soviet Far East regions as a window toward promoting economic cooperation with the countries of the Pacific and that toward this end, the Soviet Union is studying plans to give the Soviet Far East and the Primorskiy Kray regions independent rights and to establish Communist China-style special economic zones there.

Warships To Visit DPRK Port 12-16 May

PM0905092588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 May 88 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Soviet Ships Visit DPRK"]

[Text] By agreement a detachment of Soviet warships made up of the ASW cruiser "Novorossiysk," the large ASW ship "Admiral Zakharov," and the destroyer "Boyevoy" under the flag of Admiral G.A. Khvatov, commander of the Pacific Fleet, will visit the port of Wonsan from 12 through 16 May on an official friendly visit.

Dobrynin Sees Off Departing Japanese Communists

PM0905144588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The delegation of leading workers of the Japanese Communist Party headed by T. Fuwa, chairman of the Japanese Communist Party Central Committee, which had been in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, left for home 6 May.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and by senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

Comparison of Shevardnadze-Itoyama Talks

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 8 May 1988 carries in its Second Edition on page 4 a TASS report on the meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Eitaro Itoyama, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Japanese House of

Representatives. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Conversation at the USSR Foreign Ministry," has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version published in the 9 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 23-24, revealing the following variations:

Page 23, column two, paragraph two, line one, PRAVDA reads ...passed in a frank [otkrovennyy] and businesslike atmosphere. There was a thorough exchange of views... (substituting "frank" for "candid," "thorough" for "substantive")

Page 24, column one, paragraph five, line four, PRAVDA reads ...world community, to keep pace with the positive changes... (rewording)

Same paragraph, penultimate line, PRAVDA reads ...technical, and cultural, be brought into play in... (substituting "be brought" for "be put")

Paragraph six, line one, PRAVDA reads... to the so-called "territorial issue," the Soviet side... (supplying quotation marks)

Dmitriyev Comments on Asia-Pacific Security

OW0405113588 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] Last month, noted Japanese personages of political and academic circles handed Prime Minister Takeshita a list of appeals and proposals to be presented at the UN special disarmament session scheduled for June. This list, in fact, represents the views of leaders of peace-loving circles in Japan. Following is a commentary by our commentator Dmitriyev on the issue of security in the Asia-Pacific region:

Noted personages of Japan's political and academic circles are of the opinion that at the upcoming UN special disarmament session Prime Minister Takeshita should support the idea of turning the South Pacific region into a nuclear-free zone, pledge that Japan will never again become a military power, and propose the convocation of a Hiroshima conference on disarmament in the Asia-Pacific region. It should not be too difficult for the Japanese Government to carry out at least one of these demands.

Whenever the opportunity arises, Japanese Government leaders say that Japan will never become a military power. While making this public pledge, however, Japan has been transformed into one of the top military powers in the world. Year after year, it has been increasing its military expenditures at a pace faster than that of member nations of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It goes without saying that such a policy runs counter to the proposal made by politicians and academicians for holding a disarmament conference in Hiroshima. This proposal says that, according to Japan's public opinion, the security of Asian nations as well as that of Japan itself should be guaranteed not by a military buildup but by a reduction of military capability. And second, that security should be guaranteed by the joint efforts of nations in this region.

In a sense, this position corresponds with the concept for a comprehensive security system for the Asia-Pacific region proposed by the Soviet Union. This concept was made known to Japan through General Secretary Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok in July 1986.

What are the issues raised in this concept? In the past, various nations or groups of nations have tried to strengthen their security by building up their defense capabilities. These efforts have been made by regarding other nations or blocs of nations as targets in disregard of their own will and whether or not these efforts are officially recognized. This process has resulted in intensified confrontation and tension and has created artificial threats, or rather, nonexisting threats in most cases. Moreover, unlike the situation in Europe, Asian nations have more distinctive differences in their military and political conditions. And in fact, there is no effective way to control this process at present. What measures can be taken to change the situation?

The Soviet Union has suggested that Asian nations sign a number of agreements in which the legitimate interests of all nations are taken into consideration. These agreements may serve as the basis for establishing a security system in Asia. The value of such a system lies in the fact that it is not those nations with strong military capabilities that will benefit from it but that all participating nations will be able to share equal benefit.

To establish such a system, the Soviet Union proposed that a conference of all Asian nations be held similar to the conference of all European nations on security and cooperation held in Helsinki in 1975. In his Vladivostok speech, General Secretary Gorbachev also stated his views on the specific principles on which an accord can be reached concerning a comprehensive security system in Asia.

Terming this proposal as mere propaganda, the Japanese Government has so far rejected it. Then how can we explain the fact that Japanese politicians and academicians have maintained a position which corresponds with what General Secretary Gorbachev proposed in his Vladivostok speech?

It appears that in Japan, not all Japanese feel that the country's security is guaranteed by the military alliance between Japan and the United States. This is the very reason why there is a growing demand that appropriate political rather than military measures be taken in order to guarantee the nation's security. A (?consensus) for this demand is now being created.

The Soviet ambassador to the Philippines stated in Manila the other day that the Soviet Union is reducing, instead of strengthening, its military presence or military posture in the Asia-Pacific region. Soviet Admiral Chizhov made a similar statement. For example, the number of missile-carrying submarines has been reduced to some extent. However, the most important measure that has been taken is that the Soviet Union has agreed to abolish the SS-20 intermediate-range missiles deployed in Asia aimed exclusively at the Asia-Pacific region.

In response to this Soviet measure, the Japanese ruling clique did nothing but issue a statement saying that the step taken by the Soviet Union has not changed the situation in the Far East. In fact, it has even caused a situation similar to panic. In the end, the situation got so serious that (Dean Davis), an American expert, had to make a speech in Tokyo in early April to convince Japanese officials that the removal of intermediate-range nuclear weapons will not impair Japan's security.

Despite this development, both the United States and Japan have signed an accord on the joint development of a new generation of nonnuclear weapons by their respective ministries and agencies related to national defense. The plan to deploy Tomahawk cruise missiles on U.S. ships cruising waters close to the Soviet border from bases in Japan has not changed.

At recent Japanese Diet sessions, it has become apparent that the government and opposition parties have differing views on the issue of security. Dietmen of the opposition parties demand that, in response to the Soviet agreement to abolish the SS-20's deployed in Asia, the government request that the United States withdraw the F-16 fighter-bombers deployed at the Misawa base and strictly abide by Japan's three nonnuclear principles.

Regarding the people's demand for the government's support for the plan to turn Asia into a nuclear-free zone, surveys conducted by TASS and KYODO news agencies indicate that over 77.5 percent of the Japanese people support this plan. After the peace accord on the political settlement of the Afghan issue was signed in Geneva, Japanese papers began to state the view that the time has now come to seriously deal with the Soviet proposal concerning Asian security.

Thus, the Japanese leadership is taking a rigid position on the issue of security in the Asia-Pacific region. This is apparently because of political pressure both at home and abroad. This is indicated by the fact that politicians and academicians submitted their request to Prime Minister Takeshita the other day.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

More on Gilashvili-Led Delegation Asian Tour

Meets With Jakarta Officials

PM1005082188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] Jakarta, 5 May—The visit to Indonesia by a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies headed by P.G. Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has ended. The Soviet parliamentarians met yesterday with Indonesian Vice President Sudharmono. During their conversation, he stressed the need to increase mutual understanding and cooperation among all peoples and overcome mutual suspicion and distrust. The Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is positive in this regard, Sudharmono said. Movement in this direction must be sustained, the vice president indicated, expressing the hope that the Soviet-American treaty to halve strategic offensive arms will be signed.

Indonesia's active, independent foreign policy course envisages the development of friendly relations with all countries, irrespective of their sociopolitical system, on the basis of the principles of mutual respect, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, and mutually beneficial cooperation. It is on these principles that Indonesia intends to develop and strengthen ties with the Soviet Union.

The USSR parliamentary group visited the Indonesian Parliament, where it met with Kharis Suhud, speaker of the People's Consultative Assembly, and held an exchange of opinions with members of the parliamentary committees on foreign affairs and interparliamentary cooperation.

The Soviet parliamentarians spoke about the process of restructuring taking place in various aspects of Soviet life. Attention was drawn to the importance of further developing interparliamentary ties. The invitation to Indonesian parliamentarians to visit the Soviet Union was confirmed. The Indonesian side also expressed its readiness to develop contacts between Indonesian and Soviet parliamentarians.

The sides advocated deepening trade and economic cooperation between them. Kh. Suhud noted the importance of work to reveal reserves capable of increasing commodity turnover. The Soviet side drew attention to the opportunity to supply Indonesia with machinery and purchase agricultural produce here.

At the final roundtable meeting involving Indonesian journalists, P.G. Gilashvili spoke highly of the exchange of opinion that had taken place.

The group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies left for Singapore yesterday.

Calls on House Speaker

BK0705095088 Jakarta MERDEKA in Indonesian 3 May 88 pp 1, 11

[Text] Jakarta, Monday [2 May], MERDEKA—Pavel G. Gilashvili, head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation, has the same outlook on the need to end the nuclear arms race that is haunting mankind.

Gilashvili made these remarks in reply to a question posed by M. Kharis Suhud, chairman of the House of Representatives [DPR], at the DPR building at Senayan, Jakarta, on Monday [2 May].

The Soviet parliamentary delegation comprising Pavel G. Gilashvili, Vladislovas K. Mikuchyauskas, and Vera Levedeva paid a courtesy call on DPR Chairman M. Kharis Suhud, accompanied by Vice Chairman Saiful Sulun.

Receiving his guests, Kharis Suhud said that the superpowers are now in general engaged in the arms race. "It would be better for funds to be used for development in the interest of mankind, rather than the arms race," Kharis said.

"We all know that the present pollution is very great, as great as the consequences of nuclear arms," Gilashvili said.

Accordingly, Gilashvili agreed that nuclear arms should be given up and funds earmarked for overcoming pollution.

He also agreed with disarmament. He even asserted that human beings are provided with minds, but their actions are often illogical.

Gilashvili said Indonesia as a big country full of smiles has a major role in world developments, especially in the Asia-Pacific region.

Accordingly, Indonesia is expected to present ideas at international meetings, such as the UN General Assembly, urging superpowers to work toward the progress of nations in the world.

"It has become the Indonesian people's principle to contribute actively to world peace and order," Kharis Suhud added.

Kharis Suhud said further that with world peace, we can develop our own nations. This is indispensable for the Indonesian people because they want to eradicate world backwardness.

In the meantime, focusing on Indonesian-Soviet trade relations, Gilashvili said he believed that although Soviet products were not as good as those produced in the United States and Europe, the Soviet Union would produce goods needed by Indonesia if Indonesian-Soviet trade relations were encouraged.

Similarly, Indonesia can produce goods needed by the Soviet Union.

According to Soviet Ambassador to Indonesia Vladimir M. Semenov, who accompanied the Soviet parliamentary delegation, both countries can also cooperate in the field of agriculture.

For example, Indonesia can ask the Soviet Union for agricultural machines that can subsequently be paid for with the agricultural products themselves.

After paying the courtesy call on the DPR chairman, the Soviet delegation met with the Interparliamentary Cooperation Board [BKSAP] led by its chairman, Sarwo Edhie Wibowo.

During the meeting at the BKSAP hall, Sarwo Edhie Wibowo—accompanied by Waltom Silitonga, chairman of Commission I [parliamentary commission in charge of foreign affairs, security, and information], and leaders of the other DPR commissions—and the delegation discussed policies pursued by the respective governments.

Answering a question from a BKSAP member, Mrs Mien Sugandhi, a member of the Soviet parliamentary delegation, Vera Levedeva, said that the Soviet parliament has 1,500 members.

About 33 percent of them or 492 members are women, while women number 149 million or account for more than half of the Soviet population of 281 million.

News Conference Held

BK0705103088 Jakarta MERDEKA in Indonesian 4 May 88 pp 1, 11

[Text] Jakarta, Tuesday [3 May], MERDEKA—The Soviet Union does not intend to influence values or norms in the societies of other nations.

The head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation Gilashvili said this in reply to questions on perestroyka (restructuring) at a news conference in Jakarta on Tuesday afternoon.

He also explained that perestroyka and glasnost (openness), which are Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's two main concepts in the country's modernization program, are something new—a bloodless revolution in the Soviet Union.

"Perestroyka is an effort to implement purely socialist principles and is not a step toward liberalism, as interpreted by some circles in the West," said Gilashvili, who is also deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet (parliament).

During the 90-minute news conference, the Soviet chief delegate, who celebrated his 70th birthday at a cocktail party in Jakarta on Monday night, asserted that his country has no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of other countries through the ideas of perestroyka and glasnost.

Other socialist countries can agree or disagree with the Soviet modernization program. Even in the Soviet Union itself, not all people agree with the idea.

On Indonesian-Soviet relations, Gilashvili was of the opinion that both sides should continue efforts to strengthen relations between the two countries. His delegation is the second to visit Indonesia in the past year.

According to Gilashvili, it is impossible to entrust to diplomats alone the development of Indonesian-Soviet relations, which are very important. He described his talks with members of the House of Representatives on Monday as very important and open. On the occasion, Gilashvili conveyed an invitation to visit the Soviet Union to the chairman of the House of Representatives.

Present at the party on Monday night were M. Kharis Suhud, chairman of the House of Representatives and the People's Consultative Assembly; diplomats; newsmen; and other invitees.

Asked about economic relations and cooperation with Japan, which sets territorial issues as the precondition for the start of talks on economic cooperation between the two countries. [sentence as published]

Indeed, Japan insists that the Kurile Islands situated to the north of Japan and occupied by the Soviet Union since World War II be returned to Japan.

Finally, answering questions on prospects for the Reagan-Gorbachev summit at the end of this month in Moscow, Gilashvili hoped that the meeting would result in an agreement on the elimination of lethal weapons on earth.

Near East & South Asia

U.S., Soviet Mideast Aproaches Contrasted

LD1005133288 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

The situation in the Middle East, particularly in the light of the developments in the Israel-occupied Arab territories and Tel Aviv's aggression with regard to sovereign Lebanon, urgently prompts the need for a comprehensive political settlement. Therefore one can say with confidence that the Middle East problem will become the subject of discussion at a regular round of Soviet-American talks at foreign ministers' level which will begin in Geneva tomorrow.

Soviet diplomatic circles proceed from the assumption that the principle of ensuring a balance of interests of all the parties concerned should underlie a practical approach to a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. A search for constructive and mutually acceptable solutions to all aspects of the conflict and, first of all, the Palestinian one, should be conducted precisely in accordance with this principle. Such an approach presupposes that the Palestinian people's right to self-determination should be recognized and exercised in the same measure in which it is ensured for the people of Israel.

Unlike the United States, which visualizes a final settlement of the Palestinian problem exclusively within the framework of a confederation with Jordan, the Soviet Union holds that the question of choosing a form for the exercise of the Palestinians' right to self-determination is the affair of the Palestinians themselves. No one except them has a right to decide on a future of their state set-up.

The Soviet Union also approaches differently the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) and its role in a Mid-East settlement. Unlike the United States, which in every way tries to exclude the PLO from the settlement process, the USSR beieves that a solution to the Palestinian problem is impossible without equal participation of the PLO in an international Middle East peace conference.

Considering that an overwhelming majority of countries act from such positions, there is every ground to believe that to think otherwise is to think out of tune with our times when an overall emphasis in the development of inter-state relations shifts icreasingly towards a constructive dialogue on the basis of taking into account the interests of one another.

To seek monopoly on a solution of the Mid-East settlement problem means to act contrary to the growing practice of large-scale international interaction in the cause of settling crisis situations.

Casualties Reported in Rocket Attack on Kabul

LD0905175188 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 9 TASS—Enemies of national reconciliation today fired missiles at densely populated districts of the capital of Afghanistan. A total of 17 missiles were fired. Missiles fell mainly between houses on the lawns where children played. According to preliminary data, not less than 11 people were killed, mainly children. 12 people were wounded.

U.S. Urges Afghan Rebels To Continue Civil War

PM0905114188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Risky Strategy"]

[Text] New York, 7 May—THE NEW YORK TIMES has learned that the U.S. Administration sent a message to the leaders of the armed Afghan opposition last week. The message effectively calls for a continuation of the civil war in Afghanistan after the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country.

In this message, which was conveyed to Peshawar by Z. Khalilzad, special adviser to the U.S. deputy secretary of state, the White House makes clear that "the establishment of their control over the bulk of the country" is the main condition for U.S. support for the "efforts of opposition groupings to form a transitional government."

THE NEW YORK TIMES cites a "highly placed State Department representative," who bluntly says that such a government must oppose the "Soviet-backed Kabul regime." According to him, the United States "does not recognize the legality" of the government in Kabul at all.

The newspaper points out that the White House message also contains specific recommendations to set up an "Islamic government." One scenario, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, is as follows: "Groups of insurgents based in Pakistan will announce the formation of a government while the military leaders of the mujahidin inside the country will swear loyalty to it. According to reports from Pakistan, the leaders of the armed opposition "have already dispatched groups of their representatives into the Afghan provinces of Paktia, Lowgar, and Konarha to study potential sites for the location of the transitional government."

In reporting the content of the message THE NEW YORK TIMES does not conceal its alarm concerning the administration's plans. They quote Selig Harrison, the authoritative scholar from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, who stresses that the White House is adopting a high-risk strategy which could embroil the United States in a protracted civil war in Afghanistan.

People in UN circles, where the signing of the Geneva agreements was received with great satisfaction, are expressing bewilderment at the U.S. stance, which is leading to a de facto breach of the accords in question. Here it is being recalled that, as J. Perez de Cuellar stressed in his letter to the chairman of the UN Security Council, "the USSR and the United States have been named as guarantors of the agreements and have made an official declaration in that regard."

Turkestan General on Troop Withdrawal

LD0905133488 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 9 May 88

[Pankratov remarks recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Just a few days are left before 15 May, when the Geneva accords go into effect and the Soviet Union begins to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. Is everything ready for this? Our correspondent put this question to Major General Yuriy Pankratov, first deputy chief of the Turkestan Military District Political Department. The contingent stationed in Afghanistan belongs to that military district.

[Pankratov] We began preparations for the pullout long ago, as soon as it was decided in principle to reach a settlement in Afghanistan. When the Geneva accords were signed preparations entered a new phase. From a military viewpoint we have to take into account the interests of our own unit, which must return home without unnecessary losses, and the interests of Afghanistan. The process of withdrawal will show how well we achieve our objective. One half of the Soviet military contingent is to leave Afghanistan on the first 3 months, beginning with 15 May.

[Announcer] The West claims that Soviet generals have lost the Afghan war. According to it that's why the Soviet Union decided to pull out its troops. What do you think about this?

[Pankratov] We sent troops to Afghanistan in 1979 in answer to the Afghan Government's request. The Afghan leadership asked us to help it protect the country against external counterrevolutionary forces. We have given aid to Afghanistan for almost 9 years, and it's absurd to speak about defeat. It will be more appropriate to ask whether we succeeded in accomplishing our tasks or not. From the military viewpoint, we did. We prevented outside counterrevolutionary forces from destroying the Afghan people's gains. That is why we are leaving Afghanistan with a sense of having done our internationalist duty.

[Announcer] What will the Afghan people face when Soviet troops leave their country?

[Pankratov] Political foundations for a settlement in Afghanistan have been clearly formulated. They are based on the policy of national reconciliation. Having signed the Geneva accords, the Soviet Union, as the United States, is a guarantor of compliance with them. The Afghans will have to solve their problems on their own and, if necesssary, rebuff those who attempt to infringe on their freedom and independence. I want to point out that there is no sense in banking on military force, on the continuation of the fratricidal war. The Afghan problem cannot be resolved by military means.

Indian Spokesman on Gandhi-Najibullah Talks

PM0905145588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Afghanistan-India: At Talks in Delhi"]

[Excerpt] Delhi, 7 May—The Indian-Afghan summit talks have been concluded here. At the final meeting, in which all the members of the official Afghan and Indian delegations participated, President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi once again examined the entire range of questions connected with implementing the Geneva agreements.

An official spokesman for the Indian Government reported at a briefing that during that meeting India and Afghanistan appealed to all the sides which signed the Geneva agreements to strictly observe all their provisions and help Afghanistan to strengthen its sovereignty and independence. The Afghan president expressed regret over "the statements made by certain circles, which are tantamount to a rejection of those agreements." The Indian prime minister also voiced concern in this regard. The official spokesman made it clear that this was a reference to Pakistani President Ziaul Haq's recent statements that Pakistan will not rest content until the present Afghan Government has been overthrown. R. Gandhi, for his part, assured President Najibullah at the meeting that India will do everything necessary for the speediest restoration of peace and stability in Afghanistan. [passage omitted]

Further on Delhi Reception

PM0905151188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Afghanistan—India: "Najibullah Visit to India"]

[Excerpts] Delhi, 5 May—Afghan President Najibullah arrived in Delhi yesterday for an official 3-day visit at the invitation of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. A ceremonial meeting with the eminent Afghan guest was held at the presidential palace.

Najibullah and R. Gandhi began talks yesterday on ways of implementing the Geneva agreements and on bilateral relations.

Speaking at a reception held in the Afghan guest's honor, Indian President R. Venkataraman stated that the Geneva agreements have opened up ways for establishing peace and normalizing the situation in the region. [passage omitted]

In his speech in reply Najibullah noted that Afghanistan attaches enormous significance to consolidating friendly ties with India.

The successful conclusion of the Geneva agreements, which are aimed at at resolving the external aspects of the situation around Afghanistan, and the policy of national reconciliation as a model for social and political peacemaking and the formation of a broadly based coalition government in a multistructured society with a pluralist parliamentary system show that common sense prevails, the president stated.

Najibullah also dwelt on Afghanistan's new initiative addressed to all opposition forces, which envisages their participation in a national peace jirgah, which would resolve the internal aspects of the Afghan problem. "I am certain that the war-weary people of Afghanistan will definitely support this constructive initiative," he said.

We, Najibullah stressed, intend to fully honor our commitments regarding the agreements, the implementation of which will begin in the next 10 days and we sincerely urge the other parties to act likewise.

We are profoundly grateful for the selfless and constant support shown by our northern neighbor—the Soviet Union—in realizing our great national aspirations and for its help in defending the Afghan people's national sovereignty and independence at a critical period in their history.

The new Afghanistan will be created. However, we will never forget the effective support and selflessness of India, our loyal friend, which came to our aid in a grim period in our history and gave political support to Afghanistan in the international arena and assistance in the economic, technical, and cultural spheres.

Talks between Afghan Foreign Minister 'A. Wakil and Indian Minister of State for External Affairs Natwar Singh were held in Delhi on the same day.

Visit Reviewed

PM0905143988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Korovikov dispatch: "In the Spirit of Geneva"]

[Text] Delhi, 6 May—The 3-day official visit of President Najibullah of Afghanistan, which ended today, elicited a broad response from the Indian public and gave rise to extensive commentaries in the local press. This is understandable, for relations with Afghanistan and the fulfillment of the Geneva accords in full are of vital significance to India. The elimination of a dangerous hotbed of tension at the very center of Asia could lead to real detente in other "hot spots" in the region too, improve the entire political atmosphere in South Asia, and halt the growing arms race here. It is natural that the

Indian Government hailed and fully supported the documents signed in Geneva and expressed its desire to help to realize the accords. Precisely this was the motivation for Rajiv Gandhi's invitation to the Afghan president to visit India.

The two leaders held several talks in Delhi, discussing in detail the situation around Afghanistan and the problems associated with fulfilling the Geneva agreements, with the course and prospects for national reconciliation, and with the formation of the future coalition government. They were unanimous that Afghanistan must be a stable nonaligned state and that all interference in its internal affairs must be completely ruled out.

President R. Venkataraman of India pointed out that "the Geneva agreements must completely remove all excuses for mass deliveries of modern weapons to Pakistan which could be used against India." The essence and spirit of the Geneva agreements are reconciliation and the reaching of a compromise in the name of the Afghan people's fundamental interests, in the name of peace on earth. This is how they are assessed in Delhi and Kabul.

However, Islamabad and Washington try to interpret the Geneva agreements in a different spirit. The Pentagon hastened to declare that large-scale military deliveries to Pakistan and the armed opposition in Afghanistan would not only continue but also increase. This policy gives rise to sharp protests in India. Pakistan has essentially been turned into a powder magazine and a U.S. military-strategic bridgehead in South Asia—which is fraught with very dangerous consequences. Attempts to get around the Geneva agreements and use them in one's own mercenary interests will lead to no good, either.

In the editorial "Diplomatic Hypocrisy" the Delhi newspaper INDIAN EXPRESS writes that Pakistan is arming and strengthening Afghan Islamic fundamentalists in order "with their help to keep Afghanistan under its control." It is clearly no coincidence that Pakistan reacted sharply, and even spitefully, to the Afghan president's invitation to Delhi.

The significance of the Afghan president's visit to India lies, above all, in the fact that it demonstrated the unity of the two states' approach to the Geneva agreements and the need for a peaceful constructive solution to the Afghan problem.

President Najibullah declared at a news conference before flying out of Delhi that the way to cooperation and to active involvement in the country's affairs is open for all political groups and leaders. The fruits of national reconciliation are in evidence. An increasing number of refugees are returning to Afghanistan. The first free elections to the National Council have been held. A split is growing even in the ranks of the Peshawar "Seven," who now reject the Geneva agreements. If individual groupings try to wreck the process of national reconciliation, political suicide awaits them, the Afghan president declared. He expressed the firm conviction that India's international influence and prestige will play an important role in creating a nonaligned, unified Afghanistan. The spirit of the Delhi Declaration signed by R. Gandhi and M.S. Gorbachev 18 months ago has found concrete embodiment in the Geneva accords.

Questions of bilateral cooperation between India and Afghanistan occupied a prominent place during the visit. Problems of assisting the returning refugees and restoring and developing Afghanistan's economy were discussed.

The visit marked a constructive new stage in the development of Indian-Afghan relations.

Maslyukov Receives Afghan Planning Chief

PM0905155388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Yu.D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, received M. Koshani, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee of the Republic of Afghanistan, who is currently in Moscow, on 4 May.

King Husayn Receives Special Envoy Sytenko

LD0905163688 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Amman May 9 TASS—King Husayn of Jordan had two meetings here on Sunday with special representative of the Soviet leadership Mikhail Sytenko. In the course of long conversations the Soviet representative handed over to the king the Soviet Government's statement, dated April 26, this year, and informed him of the content and the significance of the Geneva agreements on political settlement around Afghanistan. It was underlined that these agreements signified the victory of the new political thinking, were an important breakthrough in unblocking regional conflicts through peaceful means. Meanwhile they are the touchstone of sincerity of the intentions of their participants with regard to the obligations undertaken. The Geneva agreements are actually a comprehensive set of principles and provisions for settlement of the foreign aspects of the Afghan problem. As the first step, they provide for termination of interference in Afghanistan's affairs.

King Husayn, on his part, informed the Soviet interlocutor of the Jordanian leadership's efforts aimed at promoting normalization of the Afghanistan situation. It was noted that Jordan was consistently advocating implementation of the Geneva agreements and would respectively pursue this goal in contacts with the sides concerned. The king underlined that the successful solution of the Afghan problem was of great significance for settlement of other regional conflicts through political means.

An exchange of opinions was also held on questions of Middle East settlement, the Iran-Iraq conflict and other issues of mutual interest.

Jordan, Egypt View Soviet Regional Policy

Husayn: Constructive, Dynamic

PM0905142288 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reasonable Step"]

[Text] Amman, 8 May—King Husayn of Jordan described the Soviet Union's position on the Near East problem as "constructive, dynamic, and responsible." We hope, he stated at a news conference held here for foreign journalists, that the United States will also adhere to such a position. The Jordanian head of state roundly condemned the memorandum of understanding signed between the United States and Israel last month, which provides for the further development of bilateral cooperation in the political, economic, and military spheres. [PRAVDA 9 May Second Edition version ends here]

King Husayn reaffirmed that the establishment of just peace in the region is possible only within the framework of an international conference on the Near East with the participation of all parties involved in the conflict, including the PLO. The main obstacle in the path of holding such an international forum, he stressed, is the obstructionist position of the Tel Aviv ruling circles.

The Jordanian head of state spoke positively of the developments taking place in the international arena recently. He numbered among them the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the resolution of the Afghan problem which has begun, and the continuing Soviet-American dialogue. "We hope progress will be achieved at the forthcoming Moscow summit meeting," King Husayn said.

Mubarak: Flexible, Positive

PM0905095388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Speech by H. Mubarak"]

[Text] Cairo, 3 May—Egypt was satisfied to hear the news that agreements on a settlement of the Afghan problem had been signed in Geneva, Egyptian President H. Mubarak said. According to MENA, speaking here on Working People's International Solidarity Day, he expressed the hope that the Geneva agreements will provide the fraternal Afghan people with the opportunity to restore their national unity and order their country's destiny without outside interference.

The president noted that "the USSR is devoting a great deal of attention to discussing every aspect of a Near East settlement with all interested parties and has taken a flexible, positive stand, expressing the desire to make progress at the negotiating table."

Touching on the Palestinian problem, the head of the Egyptian state emphasized that the situation in the occupied Arab territories has sharply changed as a result of the uprising by the heroic Palestian Arab people, whose courage is admired by the whole world. Its aim is to end the Israeli occupation and prove that its continuation is impossible. H. Mubarak criticized the stand taken by Tel Aviv and stressed that Israel has never been able to begin a dialogue with the Palestinians and use it as a means of achieving a comprehensive peace settlement.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Nikanorov Views London Talks on Southern Africa

PM0905113988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Nikanorov "Notes Apropos": "Don't Let The Light Go Out"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA has already reported, a quadripartite meeting of representatives of Angola, Cuba, South Africa, and the United States on problems pertaining to the settlement of the situation in southern Africa has been held in London.

The joint communique stresses that the "talks took place in a constructive atmosphere, and progress was achieved at them." It is planned to hold the next meeting, at a higher level, in an African country in the very near future. The South African paper THE SUNDAY STAR, citing informed circles, names the Republic of Cape Verde. According to the paper, South Africa declared that it would participate in an international conference on Namibia attended by Cuba, Angola, the United States, and the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), but it insists that the Angolan antigovernment grouping, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA], be included in the list of participants.

As is known, this band of terrorists is on the payroll of South African and U.S. special services. On more than one occasion, South African regular troops have come to UNITA's aid at critical moments. It was on prompting from Pretoria that J. Savimbi announced the formation of his government. Presumably, at some point, Pretoria will pull this "trump card" out of its sleeve. In fact, judging by the item in THE SUNDAY STAR, this is already happening, and it indicates only one thing: The apartheid regime is still opposed to the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 435, which envisages the withdrawal of South African forces from Namibia, the granting of independence to it, and the holding of elections under international supervision.

Describing the results of the London talks, A. Van Dunem, Angolan minister of external relations, rejected any link between the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola and the granting of independence to Namibia. He stressed: Displaying goodwill, the Angolan Government proposed in March a settlement plan incorporating the principle of a stage-by-stage withdrawal of Cuban forces. An important condition of their complete evacuation from Angola, the minister pointed out, is for Washington and Pretoria to cease supporting the UNITA grouping.

U.S. delegation head C. Crocker stressed at a news conference that the atmosphere of the meeting and of the discussion of regional conflicts, including Angola and Namibia, had been made favorable by the Soviet-American dialogue. But there was an unconstructive note to his statement that "Washington does not intend to end its links with UNITA."

On the eve of the London meeting, the SAPA news agency pointed out that Pretoria sees it merely as the "opening of a diplomatic window." South African President P. Botha warned "against excessive optimism." It appears that the leaders of the apartheid regime agreed to the talks reluctantly. They do not want to, but the explosive situation that has developed in South Africa itself, losses on the fronts, and international isolation are making them seek a way out of the impasse.

A swift solution to the conflict in southern Africa should not in fact be expected. But the fact that for the first time in 13 years all parties involved in it have sat down at the same table and agreed to continue talks is a factor that gives hope. A light is glinting at the end of the tunnel or in the "open diplomatic window." Much will depend on the position of South Africa and its "strategic ally," the United States, if the weak but long-awaited light is to be prevented from going out.

East Europe

Polish Council: Reform Process Irreversible

LD0905211888 Moscow TASS in English 2018 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Warsaw May 9 TASS—The all-round process of reforms is the main condition for further socio-economic development of Poland, and it is irreversible. This was underlined at a meeting of the Central Cooperation Commission of the Polish United Workers Party, the United Peasant Party and the Democratic Party which was held here today. It was attended by all signatories to the declaration on formation of the National Patriotic National Revival Movement.

Present at the meeting were First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party Wojciech Jaruzelski, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic Zbigniew Messner, Chairman of the Main Committee of the United Peasant Party Roman Malinowski, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Democratic Party Tadeusz Witold Mlynczak, Chairman of the All-Poland Council of the Patriotic National Revival Movement Jan Dobracinski.

The participants in the meeting analysed the present-day socio-economic situation in the country and underlined that the realization of the second stage of the economic reform temporarily gives rise to consequences painful to a considerable part of the population. The deepening of and support by the whole population for the processes of reforms will help overcome these difficulties faster.

Tensions and disputable problems arising on the way should be resolved in compliance with the law, through dialogue and agreement rather than through staging illegal actions which are directed against the process of reforms, and weaken Poland's position in the international scene.

The meeting expressed confidence that the overwhelming majority of the population, who once again displayed the sense of responsibility worthy of respect, calm and dignity, are the most reliable guarantor of consistent realisation of the course of reforms, democratization and social renovation.

The Central Cooperation Commission declared for emergency powers to be granted to the government, which will be the basis for actions to accelerate the process of reforming Poland's economy.

PZPR Politburo Urges Realism, Responsibility

PM0905154188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "In Fraternal Parties"]

[Text] PZPR Central Committee Politburo Session [subhead]

Warsaw, 4 May—Discussing the course of this year's May Day celebrations at its latest session, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo noted the mass participation in the celebrations of the country's citizens. Gratitude was expressed to all those who by taking part in the May Day festivities had demonstrated their support for the socialist renewal, democratization, glasnost, economic reform, and national accord. This is all the more valuable in view of the fact that the implementation of the changes is under threat.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo fully understands and shares the citizens' concerns and favors the solution of the arising contradictions and problems in cooperation with workers' collectives. However, this has to be accompanied by realism and a sense of responsibility for the future of Poland. It is necessary to resolutely counter the threat of the destabilization of the economy and the ensuing inevitable deterioration of citizens' living and working conditions. A slump in production and a depletion of the market, breaches of public peace, law and order, and discipline are especially to be avoided. This is in the common interests of all the working people which are more important than any differences.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo expects from all party organs and organizations and from state power organs greater consistency and resolve in the implementation of reforms, the development of self-management, and the broadening of the working people's participation in economic management and the solution of the country's problems. Socialist pluralism and the development of democracy have created and will continue to create ever greater opportunities for the expression of different views and initiatives and provide broader scope for public activeness. Poland's well-being must be the common denominator, the PZPR Central Committee Politburo emphasized.

Enterprises 'Working Normally' Except in Gdansk

PM0905115888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Metal Workers at Work"]

[Text] Warsaw, 8 May—The traditional Metal Workers' Day was marked in Poland today. A ceremonial meeting with the participation of metal workers from all over the country was held in the city of Stalowa Wola. Z. Messner, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, sent a message of greetings to the metal workers.

Enterprises with a continuous production cycle were working normally today throughout Poland. According to the management of the Nowa Huta steel combine, the dispatch of output to clients continued there, especially the output whose shortage particularly affects the production of consumer durables. The combine is not yet working at full capacity, since it is still in the course of preparing to start up equipment and assemblies that were stopped during the recent strike by workers at certain shops.

The exception is the Gdansk shipyard, where several hundred people, spurred on by extremists, are refusing, despite the management's orders, to vacate the shipyard premises they have occupied. Talks between the enterprise management and the participants in this action have yet to bear fruit, despite the good will shown by the management.

According to a PAP report, on 7 May the Warsaw Center district collegium on violations of the law sentenced J. Onyszkiewicz, one of the leaders of the banned "Solidarity," to 6 weeks' detention. The report notes that he has recently displayed increased activeness as one of the main informers of the Western mass media, which are conducting anti-Polish propaganda.

Further on Situation

LD0905200988 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Warsaw May 9 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Pershin reports:

Polish newspapers, radio and television in their news bulletins report the full-blooded functioning of industrial enterprises, institutions, work collectives of the country. The situation in the Nowa Huta steel mill is returning to normalcy. It is catching up with the volume of production which was lowered by the strike, and is shipping products to customers.

The disturbances in the country painfully affect the interests of the countryside and peasantry, undermine the process of socio-political and economic reforms in Poland, weaken Poland's positions in the international scene. This was noted during the meeting of representatives of the All-Poland Peasant Union, countryside circles of the organization with chairman of the Main Committee of the United Peasant Party, Marshal of the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic Roman Malinowski. A resolution of that mass public-professional organization which was issued here, expresses support for the second stage of the economic reform and underlines that under no circumstances one should depart from the process of democratization of Poland's social life.

The Gdansk shipyard is, as before, the only seat of tension in the country. The PAP news agency reported that an insignificant part of shipbuilders continue occupying some premises of the enterprises. The shipyard director made a statement underlying that under the obtaining financial-economic position of the shipyard, heightened by its standing idble, the Polish National Bank and the Finance Ministry of the Polish People's Republic consider it impossible to continue providing it with credits and subsidies. In this situation the shipyard director requested the minister of industry of the Polish People's Republic to take decisions on the future of the enterprise.

Analysing the situation in the country, the newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU says that the anti-Socialist forces in Poland and their foreign prompters are trying to make use of the working people's discontent with the growth of prices for staging political ventures to deal a blow on reforms and the process of democratization. But the time is working against them, it is working in favour of transformations, social concord and development, the newspaper underlines.

Strikes Cause 'Empty Shelves, Endless Lines'

PM0905152588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "Poland: Defending Reform"]

[Text] Warsaw—The events of recent days in Poland have convincingly shown that it is not in vain that socialism's opponents have chosen as the chief target of their actions the economic reform and the process of democratization and socialist renewal which is conducive to it.

They and their bosses in the West realize that the reform is dangerous for them: It is aimed at restructuring the economic mechanism in the country, improving the economy and the market, and, in the final analysis, enhancing the people's well-being.

M. Rakowski, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member, vice marshal of the Polish Sejm, and chairman of the Socioeconomic Council under the Sejm, spoke during a session of the council. He said that socialist Poland has entered a period of great social, economic, and structural changes and that the reform under way is not a cosmetic operation but profound restructuring. We are looking ahead, the speaker said, but we are being dragged back to 1981, to the empty shelves in stores and endless lines, for the wild, illegal strikes which have once again put Poland on the front pages of the world's press are nothing but a blow to the republic's economy, which had emerged from the chaos of the recent past, and a blow to the reform and the policy of socialist renewal.

We have already lost a great deal both materially, M. Rakowski emphasized, and morally and politically, for the so-called opposition is creating in the world an opinion of Poland as an unreliable partner. I am afraid, he said, that it will take us a long time to work off the losses suffered in the international arena.

The strikes organized in recent days were of an economic nature at first, but they soon acquired a political hue. Those who had brought Poland to the brink of the abyss in 1981 set to work, the speaker pointed out. They have learned nothing and are now acting out the same scenario.

But the situation is fundamentally different now, M. Rakowski said: A program of transformations is being implemented, which did not exist at that time. The disturbances cannot be allowed to continue, and people expect decisive actions from the authorities.

Having examined the draft law on emergency powers for the Polish Council of Ministers in light of the implementation of the economic reform, the Socioeconomic Council under the Polish Sejm recommended it to the Sejm. These powers provide for the commissioning of all the necessary additional instruments which would defend and strengthen the process of reform and restructuring in Poland.

Miodowicz on Polish Industrial Unrest

PM0905142988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Starukhin dispatch: "Begun Work"]

[Text] Warsaw, 6 May—The metallurgical combine at Nowa Huta, near Krakow, which was one of the "refuges" of strikers in Poland, is again working at its usual rhythm. Meanwhile, the shipyard in Gdansk, where approximately 1,000 people are on strike, remains idle. Today the "geography" of the strikes in the country is probably confined to this address.

Alfred Miodowicz, chairman of the National Trade Union Confederation, held a news conference for journalists. He pointed out that the strikes and work stoppages at certain enterprises in the country were partly the result of poor explanatory work concerning the increase in prices for food, consumer goods, and services at the beginning of the year and the poor control over price setting on the part of state enterprises, but particularly on the part of private employers. Bureaucratic obstacles in the way of resolving some of the questions connected with people's daily routine and life also played an unhelpful role.

Trade unionists considered it their duty in this regard to draw up appropriate documents and send them to the Polish Council of Ministers for examination. At the same time, Polish trade unions have not approved the spontaneous, feverishly organized strikes in places where their organizers did not enter into preliminary talks with the enterprises' leaders and were clearly reckoning on a kind of economic blackmail.

Gromyko Departs for Official Visit to Romania

LD1005064188 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left Moscow for Bucharest today for an official friendly visit.

He has been invited by Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of Romania.

Gromyko was seen off at the airport by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

Ceausescu at Arrival Ceremony

LD1005101888 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Bucharest May 10 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, arrived here today for an official friendly visit.

At the airport Andrey Gromyko and his wife were met by Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, and his wife, by party and state figures of Romania, and by representatives of the working people of the city.

Ceausescu Report on Development Published

PM0605111488 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 88 First Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Tasks for the New Stage"]

[Text] Bucharest, 5 May—The Romanian press yesterday published the report of N. Ceausescu, RCP secretary general and Romanian president, on certain problems of socioeconomic development, ideological work, and the international situation. The report was examined at the 29 April session of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and approved as theses for the forthcoming RCP Central Committee plenum. Practice shows, N. Ceausescu stressed, that complex questions of economic activity and society's development can no longer be tackled solely in the central apparatus. The democratic system we have created demands a harmonious combination of the role of central organs and the growth of the responsibility and competence of associations and enterprises in the elaboration and implementation of domestic and foreign policy.

The report speaks of the need for cadre policy to change over to a competitive system of appointment to leadership posts, as well as the application of the principle of progressive rotation of cadres and a probationary term for persons appointed to responsible posts in party and state organs.

Demichev Present as Yazov Leaves for Berlin

LD1005110688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0801 GMT 10 may 88

[Text] Army General Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, left Moscow for Berlin on an official friendly visit today. At the airport he was seen off by Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and by other officials.

Delegation Arrives

LD1005091788 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0853 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 10 May (TASS)—A Soviet military delegation led by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense minister, arrived here today on an official, friendly visit.

At the aiport the delegation was met by Army General Heinz Kessler, SED Central Committee Politburo member and GDR national defense minister; B.V. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany; and other officials.

CSSR Leaders Greet Soviets on Victory Day

PM0905154688 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Message from CSSR's Jakes, Husak, and Strougal to Soviet leaders on Victory Day]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

To Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

To Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Esteemed comrades!

On behalf of the CPCZ Central Committee and the president, government, and people of the CSSR we send to the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers, the Soviet people, and you personally, dear comrades, sincere comradely greetings and cordial congratulations on the 43d anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory over fascism and the liberation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Army.

Our people's memory will always preserve the image of the Soviet liberator soldier, who paid with his own blood for freedom and brought peace to the peoples who suffered the horrors of fascism. It is with profound gratitude, respect, and recognition that we recall those who gave their lives for our national autonomy, independence, and freedom, for our happy future.

After our country's liberation favorable conditions were created for the Czechoslovak people, under the CPCZ's leadership, to embark on the path of buidling socialism. In this great struggle for the transformation of society and the strengthening of our autonomy, the Soviet

Union was our most loyal ally, a firm support in all times—hard and joyous. Our peoples' fraternal alliance, sealed with the blood shed together in the struggle against fascism, inspired confidence in us and became the guarantee of a peaceful life.

We remember the events of those glorious May days at a time when the world is once again seeing the inexhaustible vitality of socialism. Czechoslovak Communists and our people unreservedly support the revolutionary process begun by the 27th CPSU Congress and heralding the comprehensive development and renewal of socialism in the new conditions and the enhancement of its prestige and magnetic force in the world. At the 17th CPCZ Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums our party expressed unequivocal support for this innovative approach and the transformations in society's life.

We are aware that the complex goals of implementing the restructuring and democratization of all spheres of society's life can only be achieved through deepening and widening all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Many decades of joint fighting and endeavors have tempered the indissoluble alliance of our peoples. The recent visits to the USSR by the top leaders of our party and state unequivocally confirmed this and opened up new opportunities for the wide development of mutually advantageous relations and Czechoslovak-Soviet alliance. We will do everything to ensure that these opportunities are fully exploited.

Esteemed comrades!

We will not allow the millions of victims who were swallowed up by the whirlpool of the most terrible war in mankind's history to be forgotten. Our people support in every way the Soviet Union's resolute actions aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear war and at securing disarmament and lasting peace. Czechoslovakia will continue to take an active part in the joint struggle for peace and progress throughout the world and to promote the strengthening of the cohesion of the Warsaw Pact states and the development of all-around cooperation among the CEMA countries.

On the eve of this notable jubilee, which is so graphically inscribed in our peoples' history, we wish you, dear comrades, Soviet Communists, and all the Soviet people great new successes in fulfilling the complex tasks of restructuring socialism and in the struggle for lasting peace and progress throughout the world.

Milos Jakes

General secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee

Gustav Husak

President of the CSSR

Lubomir Strougal

Premier of the CSSR

Reciprocal Message

PM0905154488 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Message from CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers to CSSR leaders on liberation anniversary]

[Text] To Comrade Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee

To Comrade Gustav Husak, president of the CSSR

To Comrade Lubomir Strougal, premier of the CSSR

Dear comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers, on behalf of the Soviet people, send to you, and, through you, to the CPCZ Central Committee, the CSSR Government, and all the Czechoslovak people cordial congratulations on the national holiday—the 43d anniversary of the conclusion of the national liberation struggle and Czechoslovakia's liberation from the fascist aggressors.

In the past years the people of fraternal Czechoslovakia, under the leadership of their combat vanguard the Communist Party, have achieved major successes in all spheres of life. We are confident that the implementation of the comprehensive program of restructuring, radical economic reform, and democratization put forward by the CPCZ at the present, crucial stage in the country's development will enable the Czechoslovak working people to take their motherland to qualitatively new heights in socialist building.

The indissoluble friendship, close alliance, and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovaka are our biggest common gain. We value highly the fraternal nature of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations. Their equal basis and internationalism, their openness and sincerity are an important condition for increasing the effectiveness of collaboration between the two countries as they follow the joint path to common, lofty goals.

Enjoying well earned prestige, the CSSR consistently pursues a peace-loving foreign policy course and makes a weighty contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the large-scale initiatives of the Warsaw Pact states. The CSSR's policy in the international arena promotes the strengthening of positive trends in world development and the advancement of the process of disarmament and the ideas of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

We wholeheartedly wish you, dear comrades, and all the Communists and working people of Czechoslovakia happiness and prosperity and the successful implementation of the restructuring program and the decisions of the 17th CPCZ Congress.

The CPSU Central Committee

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

The USSR Council of Ministers

Murakhovskiy Marks Jubilee

PM0905110188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Portentous Anniversaries"]

[Text] Representatives of Moscow working people spoke of their desire to develop new methods and forms of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation and expand contacts between production collectives at a ceremonial meeting held 5 May. It was devoted to the 43d anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation from the fascist invaders and the 18th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the CSSR.

The report by V.I. Konovalov, deputy chairman of the Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship Society Central Board and USSR deputy minister, and other speeches pointed out that Czechoslovakia's liberation from fascism was the prologue to broad national democratic transformations and fundamental revolutionary changes which, after the working people's February victory over reaction, opened up before the country the possibility of building a socialist society. Its people's considerable achievements in developing the economy, science, and culture and the high living standard have confirmed the correctness of the chosen path.

The Soviet Army's victory over fascist Germany was a genuine festival for our country's peoples, J. Janik, first deputy chairman of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Union Central Committee and deputy chairman of the CSSR Federal Assembly, declared. That day is associated in our hearts with profound gratitude and appreciation to the Soviet people who brought peace and freedom to Czechoslovak soil at a cost of immense sacrifices. We realize repeatedly that it is thanks to the Soviet Union that we have now been living beneath peaceful skies for 43 years and thanks to its assistance and support that we are building and improving the socialist society.

The speaker gave a high assessment of the Soviet state's foreign policy initiatives and emphasized the increasing role of the socialist community in the struggle to remove the nuclear threat and strengthen peace and security.

Ya.Ya. Vagris, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of a number of ministries and departments; representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations; and military leaders participated in the meeting. J. Rehorek, CSSR ambassador to the USSR, and a delegation of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Union were present.

On the same day J. Rehorek held a reception marking the portentous anniversaries.

It was attended by Ya.Ya. Vagris, V.S. Murakhovskiy, and other officials.

The Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Union delegation was present.

In connection with the 43d anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation from the fascist invaders J. Rehorek and staffers of the CSSR Embassy laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall.

Leadership Greets GDR on 'Liberation' Jubilee

PM0905144388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[USSR leaders' message to GDR leaders on aniversary of "liberation from fascism"]

[Text] To Comrade Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council,

Comrade Willi Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers,

Dear comrades!

On the Soviet people's behalf the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers send you, the SED Central Committee, the State Council, the Council of Ministers, and all citizens of the GDR cordial congratulations on the 43d anniversary of the German people's liberation from fascism.

The path traveled by the GDR in past decades shows clearly the historic significance of the victory over German fascism for the Germans' fate. The republic's successes in socialist building are beyond doubt. The GDR today is a stable and dynamically developing state with modern industry and agriculture, advanced science and culture, and a high living standard for the population. Under the SED's leadership, your country's working people are improving their society, seeking answers to the new questions that arise, and making their contribution to strengthening world socialism.

Side by side with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries the GDR struggles actively for disarmament and the prevention of war and puts forward major foreign policy initiatives. Our joint line of creating a common European home based on respect for the peoples' social choice and the inviolability of the existing political realities serves the aim of ensuring lasting peace.

The Soviet and GDR peoples are linked by indestructible friendship and common ideals. The CPSU and the SED cooperate closely in solving the tasks facing them. Our countries are each other's most important partners in terms of the volume of their economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and other ties. The constant exchange of the experience of socialist building and its use in light of national specific features offer broad prospects for further progress and the development of new forms of cooperation.

On liberation day we express Soviet people's fraternal feelings in wishing you, dear comrades, and the Communists and all the people of the GDR success in the implementation of the 11th SED Congress decisions and happiness and prosperity.

The CPSU Central Committee

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

The USSR Council of Ministers

GDR Return Message

PM0905145988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 1988 Second Edition p 1

[GDR leaders' message to USSR leaders on anniversary of "liberation from fascism"]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee,

Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers,

Dear comrades!

On the 43rd anniversary of the victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Fatherland War and of the liberation of the German people from fascism, we convey to you, the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers, and to the whole Soviet people, the most cordial congratulations and fraternal greetings of the SED Central Committee, the State Council, the Council of Ministers, and the people of the GDR.

It is everlastingly rooted in the consciousness of the GDR people that the Soviet Union and its glorious army achieved through the destruction of Hitlerite fascism a world historic deed of liberation which opened up to the German people, too, the prospect of a peaceful and dignified existence.

Our people have used the opportunity offered through the 8th May 1945, and under the leadership of the SED have forever taken the path of socialism, peace, and mutual understanding with other peoples. It fills us with deep satisfaction that close and fraternal relations exist between the GDR and the USSR in all areas of social life. Their continuous further development and all-around deepening are and will remain a prime concern of the SED and of our socialist state and its citizens.

As a result of the persistent struggle by the Soviet Union and the other states of the socialist community, a change for the better is beginning to emerge in international relations following years of increasing confrontation. The GDR will continue to work through a policy of dialogue and cooperation with all forces of reason and realism for the realization of the socialist communisty's peace strategy.

Dear comrades!

The communists and all citizens of the GDR are following in a spirit of fraternal and internationalist solidarity the diverse efforts of the Soviet people to realize the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. We are deeply convinced that the solution of the tasks aimed at improving the socialist social order and the acceleration of socioeconomic development in the Soviet Union will bring fully to bear the driving forces inherent in socialism, and will strengthen its influence in the world. We wish the glorious CPSU and the fraternal Soviet people from our whole hearts much success in this creative work in the interest of peace and socialism.

Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council,

Willi Stoph, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers

Koenig Holds Reception

LD0705140388 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1838 GMT 6 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 6 May (ADN)—The GDR ambassador to the USSR, Gerd Koenig, gave a reception in Moscow on Friday to mark the 43d anniversary of the liberation of the German people from Hitlerite fascism.

His invitation was accepted by Yan Vagris, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Gennadiy Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov, first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of Warsaw Pact Nations; other personalities of public life in the Soviet capital, and diplomats accredited in Moscow.

Earlier, GDR Ambassador Koenig laid a wreath at the Lenin Mausoleum on Red Square and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Aleksandr Garden and honored the Soviet heroes who fell in the struggle for the liberation of the peoples of Europe from fascism.

Koenig Addresses Soviets

LD0805203688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 May 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today the GDR people are marking the 43d anniversary of the liberation of the German people from Nazi fascism. Taking part in our program is Gerd Koenig, GDR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, to the USSR.

[Begin Koenig recording] Dear Soviet comrades, for the socialist German state and its citizens this day has an everlasting historic significance. With the victory of the Soviet Union and the other states of the anti-Nazi coalition, democratic, and socialist development. During these days the citizens of our country honor the memory of the fallen sons and daughters of the Soviet people, who made the decisive contribution to the utter defeat of fascism. We remember with gratitude the effective assistance and support which the German antifascists and the young German workers' and peasants' state received from the Soviet Union.

The establishment and the flourishing of the GDR as a stable socialist state, and its present and future, are in the closest possible way connected with the party and the country of Lenin. We view the fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union as a firm foundation for moving forward together. That is why we follow with deep respect and liking the great efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet people for restructuring and renewal of the socialist society. We are sincerely interested in their successful realization.

The GDR considers it to be its patriotic and internationalist duty to be a reliable ally of the USSR in any situation. We are proud of the high level of our cooperation. The SED is consistently heading for an unconditional fulfilment of the accords reached at the top level, a purposeful development of cooperation in every sphere, and a constructive search for new, more efficient forms and methods of strengthening cooperation.

Thanks to the flexible and consistent foreign policy of the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact member states, a turn for the better in international relations is becoming visible. The GDR will continue to make every effort to further in every way the cause of peace, security, and disarmament through its own initiatives.

Dear Soviet friends, on the eve of the great holiday—the 43d anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory in the Great Patriotic War—we would like sincerely to congratulate you, assure you of our firm friendship, and wish all of you successes in the realization of the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, as well as happiness and personal well-being. [end recording]

Further on AUCCTU's Shalayev's SFRY Talks

PM1005115588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 May 88 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Poroshin report: "On Fraternal Yugoslav Soil"]

[Text] Belgrade, 4 May—A Soviet trade union delegation led by AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev has arrived in the SFRY on an official friendly visit. Z. Hrabar, chairman of the Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia, and other leaders of Yugoslav trade unions met the Soviet delegation at the capital's airport. V.S. Maltsev, USSR ambassador to the SFRY, was among the welcoming party.

The visit to Yugoslavia by the representatives of the Soviet trade unions will last for 4 days.

Soon after the arrival official talks began between the Soviet and Yugoslav trade union delegations in the Trade Unions House in the center of Belgrade. At the meeting the successful development of relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY and the deepening of mutually useful ties between Soviet and Yugoslav trade unions were noted with satisfaction. The sides noted that the recent visit to Yugoslavia of M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, gave new impetus to the development of and search for modern forms of cooperation between the two countries. Particular attention was paid in the talks to trade unions' significance and role in the sociopolitical and national economic life of the two countries.

AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev described progress in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent party Central Committee plenums and the 18th USSR Trade Union Congress and preparations for the 19th all-union party Conference. He informed the Yugoslav delegation about how the USSR trade unions are participating in the restructuring in all spheres of society's life being implemented in the Soviet Union, in the development of socialist democracy and glasnost, in the improvement of economic management, and in the accelerated development of the social sphere. The head of the Soviet delegation stressed the trade unions' growing role and responsibility in the new conditions in resolving the tasks facing Soviet society and primarily in connection with the Law on the State Enterprise, which has come into force.

Z. Hrabar, chairman of the Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia, talked about the activity of the working class and all working people in Yugoslavia in implementing the decisions of the 10th Yugoslav Trade Union Congress. He devoted much attention to the country's economic problems and the trade unions' basic tasks in further developing worker self-management, improving Yugoslav society's political system, and implementing the program of economic stabilization and the anti-inflation program. His report on trade union participation in the discussion of changes to the SFRY Constitution and on how the country's social problems are being resolved aroused great interest.

The talks noted the stable and diverse character of ties between the two countries' trade unions and stressed the great importance of further strengthening the bonds of friendship between the Soviet and Yugoslav working peoples and deepening all-around cooperation between the two fraternal countries' trade unions. Topical questions of the international trade union movement were also discussed.

The sides noted that prospects for close and fruitful collaboration between the two countries' trade unions are clearly defined in the documents adopted during the visit to the SFRY of M.S. Gorbachev—the Soviet-Yugoslav declaration and the Long-Term Program for Economic Cooperation Through the Year 2000.

Further on Krunic Meeting

LD0705143788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 May 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A Soviet trade union delegation led by Comrade Shalayev, AUCCTU chairman, is in Yugoslavia on an official friendly visit.

The delegation was received by Bosko Krunic, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium. The growing role of trade unions in solving key tasks in the development of our two countries was noted at the meeting.

The program for the visit includes meetings with the trade union aktiv and tours of a number of enterprises. One of them is the Beograd agricultural combine, which supplies the Yugoslav capital with basic produce. From the field and the farm to the shop shelves and the consumer: this is the principle by which work is organized here. Frikom, one of the combine's processing works, produces up to 10,000 tonnes of freshly frozen vegetables and 10 million liters of ice cream in 35 varieties each year. Construction of an enterprise of the same type is planned in the Soviet Union, with the assistance of Yugoslav specialists.

A news conference, held jointly by the leaders of the trade unions of the two countries, Comrade Shalayev and Zvonimir Hrabar, president of the Trade Union Federation of Yugoslavia, took place in Belgrade. One question for the two chairman: What was of particular interest in these talks for each of you?

[Begin recording] [Hrabar, speaking in Serbo-Croatian with superimposed Russian translation] We were interested above all in how Soviet trade unions are operating in the conditions of restructuring. We have taken away from our conversations the firm certainty that Soviet citizens have accepted restructuring as something which corresponds to their vital interests; and we wish the working people of the Soviet country total success along the road.

[Shalayev] If we are to talk about the most important problems which interest us, that means the trade unions and self-management, how the trade unions are participating in the development of self-management and how trade union organizations operate in self-managed labor collectives; and the second particular feature which interests us is the activity of the trade unions of Yugoslavia in matters of price-setting, the participation of trade unions in price-setting, and the protective functions of the Yugoslav trade unions. We are devoting the most fundamental attention, our main attention, to these aspects of their activity during our visit. [end recording]

Visit Assessed

PM0905172188 Moscow TRUD in Russian 9 May 88 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Poroshin report: "Visit Completed"]

[Text] Belgrade, 8 May—The official friendly visit to the SFRY by a Soviet trade union delegation led by AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev has ended. Before leaving by air for Moscow a final working meeting was held between the Soviet trade union delegation and Z. Hrabar, chairman of the Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia.

During the visit the AUCCTU chairman gave interviews to the Yugoslav trade union newspaper RAD and the Slovenian newspaper DELO. We rate our visit to Yugoslavia—he said, answering journalists' questions—as an important new contribution considerably stimulating the process of bilateral, mutually beneficial cooperation. Each socialist country's trade unions have their own tasks and problems, but they also have a considerable amount in common in their activity. It is precisely for this reason that an exchange of opinions and experience which significantly enrich our cooperation is so important. A joint communique which we have prepared and approved enshrines all our accords on further developing bilateral cooperation reached with our Yugoslav comrades during the talks.

West Europe

Nuclear Factor Influences Danish Elections

PM0905104988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 May 88 First Edition p 5

[NOVOSTI correspondent S. Serebryakov dispatch for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Danish Elections: A Hailstorm of Complaints From Near and Far"]

[Excerpt] Copenhagen—[Passage omitted] The election campaign is proceeding against a background of systematic signals from NATO capitals complaining about Denmark's "undermining of Atlantic solidarity" and calling on it to "consider all the consequences" of its policy. It is being said that NATO warships would lose the opportunity to call at Danish ports, the allies would abandon joint naval exercises in the Danish straits, the British mobile brigade would be unable to come to help in the event of a "crisis situation," and so on.

NATO's sharp reaction is attributable to three causes: First, the fact that the Danish example could spread to other smaller countries. Second, it is evident that NATO ships with nuclear weapons on board still call in Danish ports. James Bush, former captain of a U.S. strategic submarine with 26 years of service in the Navy, has no doubts on this account. "Every U.S. ship which is capable of carrying nuclear weapons no doubt has such weapons on board when entering Danish ports," he said in an interview with the newspaper LAND OG FOLK. Third, the Americans are annoyed by the active efforts made by Danish left-wingers to create a nuclear-free zone in Europe's north.

The conservative parties present the forthcoming election as a test of the durability of Denmark's ties with NATO and of the Danes' loyalty to the "ideals of freedom and equality." When raising the question of Denmark's "continued membership" of the alliance, they rely on opinion polls which indicate that 59 percent of the country's population support its membership of the alliance.

On the other hand, leading spokesmen of left-wing forces, the Social Democrats and the Socialist People's Party, are emphasizing the need to elaborate a new NATO policy taking into account the realities of the nuclear age, the general easing of international tension, and growing East-West cooperation. Stressing the immorality of nuclear weapons and the anachronism of the "flexible response" doctrine, they are struggling for a rejection of reliance on the first use of nuclear weapons and for a more active role by smaller countries in the disarmament process.

This approach reflects the Danes' real and profound worry about the nuclear threat and their desire for practical steps to further the growth of East-West trust. Proof of this can be seen in a recent opinion poll carried out by USIA: Some 62 percent of Danes were in favor of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, and 48 percent are prepared, if necessary, to waive the country's NATO membership to attain this goal.

UK Role in Wartime Murmansk Convoys Recalled

PM0905154888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondent A. Lyutyy report under the general heading "Memory Lives On": "Duty to the Fallen"]

[Text] London—In the cold Arctic waters not far from Soviet shores, the British cruiser "Edinburgh" sank in 1942 after being hit by fascist torpedoes. It was carrying out a noble mission—it was delivering from Britain to Murmansk the weapons, food, and spare parts that we so badly needed at the time.

Only a few of the "Edinburgh" crew survived. I met with some of them recently at the Soviet Embassy in London. These people came here to pay tribute to the memory of all those who died in the course of the Arctic convoys which united Britain and the USSR by a thread of assistance and mutual support in the war years.

...Sixty-four-year-old D. Tueyt [as published] wears proudly on his chest, along with his British military orders, the Soviet souvenir medal "40 Years of Victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945." He remembers how, as an 18-year-old signaler seaman, he was on board the "Edinburgh," found himself in the heat of enemy shelling, and was saved by a miracle. How, later, having decided to return to the Arctic help watch, he felt in Murmansk the warm and firm embraces of Soviet seamen who had become old friends. That, he said, was a fine friendship which I will never forget.

Soviet and British servicemen, concurs one of the leaders of the international organization "Generals for Peace and Disarmament," retired British General M. Harbottle, at that time breached the wall of alienation between our countries. We should follow their example. Real security presupposes a high level of trust for each other. The Soviet and British seamen showed in the war years that this can be achieved.

Mitterrand Elected President of French Republic

Gorbachev Congratulations

PM1005090388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 May 88
Second Edition p 1

[Message from M. Gorbachev to French President Mitterrand]

[Text] To Mr Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic,

Esteemed Mr Mitterrand,

Please accept my congratulations on your reelection to the post of president of the French Republic.

Remembering our meetings in Moscow and Paris, I expect that the continuation and activation of Soviet-French dialogue in the present crucial period and our personal contacts will have their positive part to play in promoting disarmament, building a common European home, settling regional conflicts, building confidence, and normalizing the international climate as a whole.

The Soviet Union will continue to develop its relations with France relying on the firm traditions of friendship and mutual respect of the peoples of the two countries and on the coincidence of their fundamental interests in preventing war and creating a more secure world. We are open to the all-around expansion of mutually advantageous ties with France.

I take this opportunity to wish the people of friendly France peace and prosperity.

M. Gorbachev.

Rightist 'Ideology' Defeated

PM1005095588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 May 88 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Bolshakov under the "A Correspondent Comments" rubric: "F. Mitterrand Reelected President"]

[Text] Paris, 9 May—The sensation of the second round of the presidential elections in France was not even the reelection of President F. Mitterrand—that had been predicted earlier. The sensation was the number of votes cast for him. Some 54.05 percent of voters preferred F. Mitterrand, who was supported by the French Socialist Party, the French Communist Party, and the other left-wing forces, to his rival—the present prime minister, J. Chirac, the candidate of the right-wing parties. Mitterrand is the first president in the history of the fifth Republic to be reelected for a second term.

The main result of the vote was a defeat for the policy pursued by J. Chirac and his cabinet and at the same time a defeat for the ideology preached by the rightists.

France voted against the policy which led to growing social inequality, to uncontrolled unemployment, and the uncontained decline of the population's purchasing power, that is to the actual impoverishment of millions of ordinary workers. And the future government cannot fail to consider this protest. France also voted against the rightists' attempts to dismantle the social security system—the main gain of the government of left-wing forces which came to power after the 1981 elections. J. Chirac's government also had to answer at the polls for the crushing of the student demonstrations in the fall of 1986, for the dispersal of the strikers, and, finally for the punitive operations in New Caledonia.

"By voting for F. Mitterrand, you will be voting against the right-wing peril!"—that was the slogan of the French Communists on the eve of the second round. This peril is presented today primarily by the extreme right-wing "National Front" headed by Le Pen, who for many has become a symbol of racism and xenophobia.

Yesterday, by this time after the event, Le Pen accused the right-wing leaders of "political suicide." He had in mind the leadership of the Gaullist Rally for the Republic, as whose candidate J. Chirac was nominated, and the Union for French Democracy—the bloc of right-wing parties, whose candidate was initially R. Barre, who lost in the first round, and whose candidate in the second round, with Barre's support this time, was J. Chirac.

Le Pen tried to claim that if the right-wing moderates had joined him in an official alliance, J. Chirac would have successfully avoided defeat. This "accusation" was made yesterday on television. But to the credit of the leaders of the "right-wing moderates," it was immediately rejected as absolutely groundless. An alliance with Le Pen, as Simone Weil, an eminent figure in the Union for French Democracy, stated, "is totally ruled out for democratic Frenchmen." An analysis of the results of the elections shows, however, that 8.5 percent of the voters who had voted for Le Pen in the first round voted for J. Chirac. Quite a lot... And this factor will continue to affect French politics, including the right-wing forces' further tactics.

The results of the 8 May elections are important on the international plane. The French voted yesterday against the superarms race policy which J. Chirac's government has pursued from the outset with the socialists' de facto connivance. The USSR's active foreign policy, which has made it possible recently to achieve a number of accords with the United States on the limitation of the arms race, the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in Europe, the settlement of the Afghanistan situation, and so forth, has compelled the socialists' leadership and President F. Mitterrand personally to review their former priorities in the defense sphere. J. Chirac's government, however, has ignored virtually completely the progress in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations and disarmament.

It was with satisfaction, therefore, that people in French and beyond yesterday welcomed F. Mitterrand's statement that during his second term as president, he will do everything necessary for the cause of peace and disarmament.

Right now, when the definitive results of the elections are still only being summed up, it is quite hard to make a precise forecast of the events awaiting France in the near future. According to preliminary public opinion polls, 53 percent of French people advocate the immediate dissolution of parliament and early elections. During yesterday's political debates and speeches by a number of leaders of the right-wing "center," it could be judged that the possibility envisaged by F. Mitterrand is not ruled out: to wit, appointing a new prime minister from the ranks of the "moderate" socialists. This would make it possible to avoid early elections. M. Rocard, one of the leaders of the Socialist Party, is named (by 32 percent of those polled) as one of the candidates of this kind for the post of future prime minister. Indeed, we will not speculate. Much will become clearer in the next few days.

'Total Victory' Achieved

PM1005113188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 May 88 Morning Edition pp 1, 3

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch under the rubric "Reports From Abroad": "France: Francois Mitterrand Is President for a Second Term"]

[Text] Paris—Francois Mitterrand has been reelected president of France for a 7-year term. In the second round of the presidential elections, 54 percent of the electorate voted for him. His rival, Prime Minister J. Chirac, secured 46 percent of the vote. A total of 85 percent of the electorate took part in the vote.

... Rue Solferino, where the Socialist Party headquarters are situated, was packed with people. With difficulty, I managed to force my way into the building, where several hundred people, party activists and guests as well as journalists, waited to hear the election results announced. The voting ended at 2000 hours, and within a matter of seconds, the face of the victor appeared on all the television screens. It was Francois Mitterrand.

Francois Mitterrand has secured a new mandate to govern the country, J.-J. Queyranne, official spokesman of the French Socialist Party, said in a conversation with me, and the new government will be formed on the basis of the main thrust of his policy, namely working for progress and solidarity, seeking peace, and implementing "European building." We are faced with serious problems. We are against any political mergers. The president will be devoting particular attention to the problems of disarmament, which must embrace new spheres, including the reduction of conventional types of armed forces and also the development of European cooperation. He attaches great importance to Soviet-French relations and, I believe, they will develop successfully.

C. Estier, a prominent figure in the Socialist Party, said to me: "This is a great victory for us. F. Mitterrand has repeatedly said that he approves of M.S. Gorbachev's policy—particularly in the disarmament area. He welcomed the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. I believe that from this standpoint, too, F. Mitterrand's election is a positive factor."

I went to the headquarters of Jacques Chirac, which changed its address and moved to Rue Babylone after the first round of the elections. After the prime minister had made his announcement and left, it became noticeably deserted. Dejection and confusion was written all over the faces of the activists left behind. A few people listened indifferently to F. Mitterrand's address to the nation which was being broadcast on television. The president said that in addition to the problems facing the country, he would also be concerning himself with disarmament issues.

I approached Defense Minister A. Giraud, but he categorically refused to give an interview for IZVESTIYA. One person in charge of J. Chirac's election campaign agreed to say a few words but asked me not to reveal his name: We have lost the battle but have not lost heart. We are ready for new election skirmishes. If F. Mitterrand continues with his old policies, we will soon be back in power.

"Will Chirac resign as prime minister?"

"Of course."

Only an hour after the announcement of the election results, a special edition of the newspaper JOURNAL DU DIMANCHE dedicated to the event was on sale across Paris. It cannot be denied that we could learn a few lessons from our French colleagues when it comes to expeditiousness.

And so, a total victory in the elections was achieved by F. Mitterrand, who is the first president in the history of France to be elected for a second term to the highest office of state in a national election. He secured the votes of both socialists and Communists. Some 2 million voters who had voted in the first round for Communist Party candidate A. Lajoinie, voted for F. Mitterrand in the second round, following an appeal by the French Communist Party to do so. They helped block the way to the right wing. The Communists have said, however, that they are not part of the new presidential majority. They will continue their struggle against policies designed to impinge on working people's interests, against excessive armament, and for rights and freedoms. "The elections have solved nothing," according to L'HUMANITE, "all the problems remain."

F. Mitterrand also secured the votes of some of the electorate who supported R. Barre and J.-M. Le Pen in the first round. The president built his election campaign on the slogan of French unity. Observers believe that henceforth President F. Mitterrand will not only rely on the Socialist Party but also hopes to draw centrist circles over to his side. A number of former ministers and supporters of V. Giscard d'Estaing said before the second round that they support F. Mitterrand. Some—leaders of the right-wing coalition Union for French

Democracy—said that they do not intend to systematically oppose everything proposed by the new government but will judge it on its actions. Observers believe that they could become part of the government.

The right-wing candidate J. Chirac has suffered a major defeat. The French have rejected his government's policy, which has failed to solve the problems facing the country and find a way out of the crisis. The defeat suffered by the right was also helped by the fact that it is split. This is explained to a considerable extent by the stronger positions of the extreme right-wing National Front. Now its leader, J.-M. Le Pen, is proposing that the opposition gather under its banner.

A new political landscape is now taking shape in the country, the contours of which will be more clearly defined when F. Mitterrand appoints his new prime minister and decides who will form the government, and also when the question of possibly dissolving the National Assembly—where the right wing still holds the majority—is decided. According to an opinion poll held immediately after the elections, 60 percent of French people are in favor of early parliamentary elections and 56 percent would like to see a government formed with the participation of socialists and centrists.

CPSU Delegation Returns From West Berlin

PM0905170788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by V.Ye. Ostrozhinskiy, first secretary of Ternopol Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, which attended May Day festivities of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, has returned home from West Berlin.

West Berlin Mayor Cited on 'National Capital'

PM1005103588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent S. Zyubanov under the "Rejoinder" rubric: "Not a Slip of the Tongue, Alas"]

[Text] West Berlin, 9 May—On a visit to the United States recently, E. Diepgen, mayor of West Berlin (Christian Democratic Union [CDU]), unexpectedly started talking about some "national capital for all Germans." Inasmuch as such statements, alternating with demands to restore "the Reich within its 1937 borders," were until now to be heard mainly at gatherings of FRG revanchist unions, some press representatives accompanying E. Diepgen decided he had simply made a slip of the tongue.

But last Friday the moss-grown slogans of "the eternal yesterday's men" were again heard from the rostrum of the West Berlin CDU Congress. The third point in the program of the local Christian Democrats speaks, without beating about the bush this time, of the reconstruction of West Berlin "as the Germans' metropolis and capital." It looks as though this is no longer a slip of the tongue, but a program with far-reaching ambitions.

All this verbal rubbish can in no way be reconciled with the new political thinking of which the ruling mayor considers himself a supporter. That is why it is worth recalling that, on the one hand, there is the capital of the GDR—Berlin—and on the other, there is West Berlin, a city with a special political status. These are the realities which cannot be avoided, no matter who some West Berlin figures appeal to.

EEC Flag in West Berlin Violates Agreement

PM0605130588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Zyubanov dispatch: "On the Quiet..."]

[Text] West Berlin, 3 May—By the Brandenburg Gate, a group of Soviet tourists is listening attentively to their guide's explanation. He points to the gray bulk of the former Reichstag standing on the other side of the GDR state border and explains as usual: On 30 April 1945, fighters of the 3d Shock Army raised the Victory Banner above the dome of the Reichstag....

All heads turn toward the building. The looks of the young tourists and several former frontline soldiers convey bewilderment: Fluttering over the Reichstag is a blue flag with a halo of golden stars in the middle—the official symbol of the EEC. Why? For what purpose? These are not idle questions since West Berlin, as is known, is not a member of that organization.

Nevertheless, the leading organs of the EEC in Brussels have this year proclaimed West Berlin a "city of European culture." The FRG Government has taken on the lion's share of the expenditure associated with funding the widely advertised cultural measures in the city. Is this not the solution to the riddle of the appearance of blue flags in the city that possesses a special political status?

The Soviet Union has already warned repeatedly that, under the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, West Berlin, which is not part of the FRG, cannot also be included in the exclusive grouping which is the EEC. Therefore, all attempts to draw the city into it are nothing more than a new version of "harnessing" West Berlin to the FRG, only now under the protection of the EEC's blue banners.

The socialist countries, and the Soviet Union and the GDR above all, have never been against the development of West Berlin's cultural life. However, the attempts to use international cultural measures to achieve political ends are worthy of the most resolute condemnation. The EEC's blue flags over the Reichstag and certain other West Berlin buildings symbolize the old thinking of certain Bonn politicians, which has been canceled out by life itself and in accordance with which it is supposedly possible to change "on the quiet" the realities which took shape as a result of World War II. That is a dangerous delusion.

Italian Communist Delegation Visits Soviet Union

PM0605115088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Delegation's Stay"]

[Text] Under the plan for party exchanges between the CPSU and the Italian Communist Party [PCI], a delegation of PCI veterans headed by S. Peruzzi, member of the PCI Central Control Commission, was in the Soviet Union from 27 April to 5 May.

The delegation visited Moscow and Kiev, had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee International Department, Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Gorkom, and the Soviet Committee of War Veterans, and visited an industrial enterprise and a sovkhoz. The Italian comrades were briefed on the course of restructuring in the USSR, its achievements and problems, and the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference.

In the course of the talks the Italian Communists expressed the conviction that the restructuring processes in the USSR are exerting and will continue to exert a beneficial influence on the activity of democratic and peace-loving forces in the world and on the international climate in general.

Italian Company To Supply Ads for Soviet TV

AU0605123688 Rome ANSA in English 1048 GMT 6 May 88

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, May 6—After winning an historic contract to produce television commercials to be aired on Soviet television, Italy's private television baron Silvio Berlusconi now intends to hammer out a similar accord with communist China.

After eighteen months of negotiations, Berlusconi's "Publitalia" company, on April 29, signed a three-year agreement with Soviet television which gives him a monopoly to produce all television commercials for Western firms which want to advertise on Soviet television. The accord is viewed as the "fruit" of Kremlin leader Mikhail Gorbachev's "glasnost" policy.

The accord does place some limits, however, on what can be advertised. For example, no commercials for tabacco or alcohol products will be allowed. The commercials, in fact, will be generally of an industrial nature centering on the image, technology and products of interested Western firms. The commercials will be transmitted in three pre-determined time bands, on the Soviet Union's three channels, and will not interrupt regular programming.

During a news conference here yesterday, Berlusconi announced that his "Fininvest" corporation was now ready to take on China and that the first meeting of "Project China" would be held next week.

Berlusconi's ambitions in the socialist bloc are not limited to the two communist giants. While not mentioning specific states, Berlusconi added yesterday that contacts were under way with competent authorities in other socialist nations.

The Soviet televised advertising market, where there are some 100 million television sets in a population of 280 million, represents "[word indistinct] territory" for Western companies. In 1987, the West exported 88 billion dollars worth of goods to the Soviet Union, including ten billion from the European Community and two billion from Italy alone.

Berlusconi rose to fame by setting up Italy's first national private network and presently owns three. During yesterday's press conference, he refused to reveal the forecasted earnings "Publitalia" expects to make in its "Operation-USSR".

Political & Social

Grigoryants, Others Placed Under Arrest

LD1005082888 Hamburg DPA in German 0804 GMT 10 May 88

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—Four Soviet human rights activists who, together with 100 other dissidents, founded an opposition party have been sntenced to 4-5 days "administrative arrests." Among those arrested is Sergey Grigoryants, the editor in chief of the unofficial publication "GLASNOST," a spokesman for the group announced today.

Despite massive pressure from the militia the human rights activists arranged the founding of a "Democratic Union," whose political spectrum extends from Eurocommunist theories to models for a Western parliamentary democracy. A "coordinating council" with 15 members was elected and a party program passed, it was said. [passage omitted]

A news conference has been announced for Thursday.

Dissidents Criticize Arrest

AU1005134088 Paris AFP in English 1324 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 10 (AFP)—Soviet dissidents Tuesday railed against the authorities for what they called an "act of repression" in arresting a newsletter editor helping to launch an opposition party here. Sergey Grigoryants, editor of the newsletter GLASNOST, was jailed for seven days on Monday for his role in hosting a meeting of the Democratic Union, his wife said.

Five other people working for the newsletter, named after the "glasnost" or "openness" championed by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, were also arrested, dissidents said. Friends said they didn't know where the five had been taken.

Tamara Grigoryants, flanked by several close associates, told a news conference at her home Tuesday that her husband's arrest at his dacha outside of Moscow was "illegal." She said that he was jailed for "refusing to obey authorities" and that two other members of the GLASNOST staff as well as a sympathizer had been imprisoned for five days on the same charge.

Another GLASNOST journalist, Andrey Babitskiy, was taken in for questioning on Monday but released later in the day. He said many copies of GLASNOST had been seized, including 200 copies of its first edition and 70 of its last.

Alexander Ogorodnikov, a militant who runs the "CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY BULLETIN" also attended the news conference and branded the arrest of Mr. Grigoryants an "act of repression."

Victor Aksiuchits, a member of the new Soviet section of the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), called for the immediate release of Mr. Grigoryants and the return of confiscated property. Mr. Aksiuchits said that the decision to arrest Mr. Grigoryants, who helped establish the Soviet branch of the IFJ last month, was likely taken at a high level and could herald a tougher line by the authorities toward dissidents.

The Democratic Union claims to be the first political movement independent of the ruling Soviet Communist Party since Stalinist times.

The police arrived at the Grigoryants' home in Kratovo, 40 kilometres (25 miles) from Moscow, and stopped delegates of the group as they were entering to meet there, Mrs. Grigoryants said.

Yuriy Mitiunov, a spokesman for the delegates who were sent to represent unofficial Soviet action groups, said 14 out of 60 of them arrested on Sunday were jailed Monday. The others were freed, he said, and 11 people from outside the capital were expelled from Moscow. But the group's spokesman said about 70 delegates nonetheless met in a Moscow apartment "despite repression" by Soviet authorities.

Article Lashes Dissidents' 'Cologne Appeal'

PM1005094588 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 May 88 p 9

[Lev Tokarev "Substantive Reply": "The Kind of Restructuring the 'Cologne Club' Is Yearning For"]

[Text] "Our sole objective is to make the USSR a democratic and prosperous society." This desire to do a great favor to our "authoritarian," "patriarchal," and "backward" fatherland has been expressed by the new "Cologne Club" organization set up in the FRG by "representatives of various opposition circles," or rather former citizens of the Soviet Union. The Paris newspaper LE FIGARO published under the headline "Cologne Appeal by Soviet Dissidents" a text which is in a way the club's manifesto. The text is signed by A. Avtorkhanov, V. Bukovskiy, N. Gorbanevskaya, A. Ginzburg, S. Khodorovich, A. Koryagin, E. Kuznetsov, A. Krasnov-Levitin, E. Lozanskiy, V. Maksimov, L. Plyushch, V. Rappoport, G. Vladimov, M. Voslenskiy, Yu. Yarym-Agayev, and A. Zinovyev. A curious detail: The "Cologne Club" is financed by the "Konrad Adenauer Foundation." An occasion to reawaken the ghost of the late chancellor, who, as General de Gaulle wrote in his book "Memoirs of Hope," nurtured "boundless hatred for the communist system" and was gripped by "fear of Moscow's imperialism."

The swift changes in all spheres of life in the Soviet Union, the spring thaw of renewal, glasnost, democratization, the economy's restructuring, and the honest, open, and enterprising foreign policy asserting the principles of new humanitarian thinking—all this has caused, in the words of the compilers of the "Cologne Appeal," "confusion" not only "among Soviet citizens taking a critical stance toward the regime," but also "among emigres or people in the West who take an interest in Soviet affairs." I shall leave the "Soviet citizens taking a critical stance" to the authors' conscience (we are not talking about them now), and shall only say that "confusion" is a rather mild word to apply to the panic which has gripped Sovietologists, Kremlinologists, and other Western "specialists on Russia." "Experts on Russia from the inside" (which is how A. Zinovyev, for example, described himself in an interview with the French journal LIRE) have hastened to offer their assistance, and they apparently "cannot permit themselves to stand aside from what is happening" in the USSR.

It must be admitted that the authors of the "Cologne Appeal" realize the importance of the time in which our motherland is now living. "The present period is probably the most critical in the country's entire history since the 1917 revolution," they write, and therefore they express their desire "to have their say in the argument about the nature of Gorbachev's 'restructuring.'" The reason why they invariably place in quotation marks the word "restructuring," which has firmly entered our daily vocabulary, will become clear as we go on.

The authors set themselves the task of "global and critical knowledge of the Soviet system," express certain healthy wishes about the need for "objective study" of Soviet society, wax lyrical about "collaboration" and the "struggle of ideas," and even "welcome all the transformations which lead to real improvements in living conditions for the most diverse strata of the population" in the USSR. But the smokescreen of this rhetoric conceals the political content of the "Cologne Appeal."

How do the manifesto's authors appraise today's situation in the Soviet Union? In their opinion, what the USSR is living through is not a matter of "temporary difficulties" but a "global and profound structural crisis of society, the economy, power, ideology, and culture." What could be the consequences of this downright apocalyptic crisis, or crises to be more precise? This is where the authors of the "Cologne Appeal" really come out into the open and write: "Henceforth these crises will inevitably continue to shake the society of 'real communism' (I wonder where they dug up that formula—L.T.) until such time as it finally disappears from history." People are right when they say that hatred is blind. Even Thomas Mann described anticommunism as "the main stupidity of our time," but how could anti-Soviet blindness engender the delirious dream of the "disappearance" of their motherland (even if only former!) from history, as in the case of the authors of the "Cologne Appeal"? You heave a sigh of relief: It is nice to know that our country's future does not depend on these sinister fanatics who hypocritically advocate exchange of ideas and information.

What is to be expected from restructuring? Here is what: "Regardless of the wishes and will of the authorities, a very close (from Cologne, as a matter of fact—L.T.) examination of 'restructuring,' 'glasnost,' and 'democratization' shows them to be a manifestation of the Soviet system's insurmountable tendency toward a return of totalitarian practices in Stalin's mold." The former "fighters for freedom" and "prisoners of conscience" seem to have forgotten what they used to write in "Samizdat" brochures. Now they express pity for Soviet bureaucrats and idlers: According to their perverted logic, the closure of loss-making enterprises in the USSR and the increased profitability of production "will drown in sorrow millions of people who are threatened by forced resettlement to areas" where Stalin used to send the "enemies of the people." The "nightmares" of restructuring!

The "Cologne Appeal" is dated 25 March. I don't know if the authors had had a chance to read Nina Andreyeva's article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA of 13 March. Judging by their text, they had. The dialectics of contemporary political struggle are amazing and surprising: The "defenders of the free world" and of Western democracy, speaking out against restructuring, most blatantly identify themselves with our "mourners for socialism" of the Stalinist type, as the editorial article in PRAVDA aptly described them.

To call things by their proper names, the "Cologne Appeal" is an ideological provocation whose purpose is to once more frighten the West with "intrigues" by the Russian bear which has hatched in its lair some sort of restructuring which is beyond the comprehension of moss-covered dogmatists....

Zaykov Addresses Moscow Rayon Leaders

PM1005094388 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 88 p 1

[MOSTASS report: "Conference in the Moscow CPSU Gorkom"]

[Excerpts] A conference of party raykom first secretaries and rayispolkom chairmen from the capital was held in the Moscow CPSU Gorkom 27 April.

The conference heard reports by leaders of the city's party, soviet, and economic organizations on the progress of preparations for the celebration of May Day. [passage omitted]

There was sharp criticism of the leaders of the main administrations for trade, public catering, passenger transport, and several other Moscow Gorispolkom services which have failed to take effective measures to solve the social questions which affect every Muscovite. Trade organizations were instructed to impose order in supplying Muscovites with meat and dairy products, sugar, and other foodstuffs. Law enforcement organs, jointly with the public, must pay greater attention to ensuring public order. [passage omitted]

The conference participants were assigned specific tasks whose implementation could produce tangible results for every Muscovite. It is practical deeds and real changes for the better that must become the main element for the preparations of the approaching 19th all-union party conference. Having launched socialist competition on a broad basis, the capital's working people declare full support for the restructuring currently in progress in the country and for the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum decisions, as well as their determination to welcome the conference with weighty specific results.

Preparation for the CPSU conference, the conference participants emphasized, is a matter concerning not only Communists but also all working people in the capital. It is necessary to thoroughly analyze the course of restructuring and bring to light the real achievements and the still existing problems. Special attention must be devoted to the steady implementation of radical economic reform, the introduction of economic accountability and self-financing everywhere, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and the further spread of socialist democracy.

The conference was addressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

Government Appointments, Reassignments Noted

PM0905095988 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR: OTDEL PERVYY in Russian No 11, 1988 carries on page 183 a USSR Council of Ministers decree signed by N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and M. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, dated 17 February 1988, appointing V.V. Sheremet USSR first deputy minister of the gas industry.

Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR: OTDEL PERVYY in Russian No 12, 1988 carries on pages 195-196 two USSR Council of Ministers decrees signed by N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and M. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the following effect: A.O. Kozhevnikov is appointed USSR first deputy minister of mineral fertilizer production, and L.M. Smagin is appointed USSR deputy minister of mineral fertilizer production and chief of the Cadres and Social Development Administration (17 February 1988); I.V. Koksanov is relieved of his duties as USSR first deputy minister of the shipbuilding industry "in connection with transfer to other work" (20 February 1988).

Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR: OTDEL PERVYY in Russian No 13, 1988 carries on page 208 two USSR Council of Ministers decrees signed by V. Murakhovskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and M. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the following effect: V.I. Vorontsov and A.I. Kachanov are appointed USSR first deputy ministers of foreign economic relations (25 February 1988); I.M. Bortnik is appointed first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology (27 February 1988).

Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR (OTDEL PERVYY) in Russian No 14, 1988 carries on page 216 two USSR Council of Ministers decrees signed by either V. Murakhovskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, or N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and by M. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the following effect: A.V. Aleksankin is relieved of his duties as USSR first deputy minister of land reclamation and water resources "in connection with transfer to other work" (Murakhovskiy and Smirtyukov, 1 March 1988); A.P. Tarakin is appointed USSR first deputy minister of construction, road, and municipal machine building, and Ye.V. Spiridonov is relieved of his duties as USSR first deputy minister of construction, road, and municipal machine building "in connection with his retirement on pension" (Ryzhkov and Smirtyukov, 10 March 1988).

Academy of Sciences Restores Bukharin's Title

LD1005132588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow, 10 May (TASS)—By decision of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Nikolay Bukharin, the Soviet party and state figure, economist-academic, and sociologist, has had the title of academician restored to him. This decision was made today by the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The decision reads: "In connection with the full state and party rehabilitation of N.I. Bukharin, an outstanding party figure and an eminent academic in the field of the social sciences, and in connection with clearing his name—criminally blackened during the years of the J.V. Stalin personality cult—the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences has decided:

"1. To restore posthumously the title of full [deystvitelnyy] member of the USSR Academy of sciences for (Academician) Nikolay Ivanovich Bukharin.

"2. To present a proposal to the general assembly of the USSR Academy of Sciences that it cancel the decision of the general assembly of the USSR Academy of Sciences of 21 May 1937, protocol No 7, in particular concerning the expulsion of N.I. Bukharin from membership in the USSR Academy of Sciences and membership in the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences."

This decision of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences was published today in IZVESTIYA.

Recently, a correspondent of the paper writes, commenting on this decision, much has been done to return to the people and to history the name and personality of Nikolay Bukharin. The next thing will be the return to science of his theoretical legacy. Not everything in it is straightforward. Bukharin also held mistaken positions and ones that have not been confirmed by history.... We remember that Lenin entered into polemics with him on more than one occasion.

Nevertheless, the fact that Bukharin's legacy was removed for decades from the arsenals of our social sciences impoverished and emasculated these arsenals, as there is harmony between his legacy and our present thinking, the search for solutions to today's economic and social problems.

Azberbaijan Floods Cause R7 Million Damage

PM1005114988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 88 Morning Edition p 8

[Report by own correspondent R. Talyshinskiy: "Three Days Of Rain"]

[Text] Azerbaijan SSR—The Kura and Araks Rivers have burst their banks after 3 days of rain. In places the water level has risen by 3 meters.

The Kura winds through Sabirabadskiy Rayon, covering a distance of more than 100 kilometers. There are settlements and grain, cotton, and feed crops on the river bank. In a matter of hours all of it was under water. The "Pravda," "Kommunizm," and "Mugan" kolkhozes and the one named for S. Vurgun lost a total of around 20,000 hectares of crops. The rayon center, which is at the very spot where the two rivers meet, is also in danger. A Pioneer camp and roads in the area have been flooded and several bridges have been swept away. Around 250 houses have been washed away in 12 settlements on the banks of the Kura and the Araks.

In another rayon—Imishlinskiy—the river destroyed the embankment on the territory of the "Araz" Kolkhoz and encroached 30 meters onto the land.

In Masallinskiy, Lenkoranskiy, and Astarinskiy Rayons trouble was caused by small and seemingly innocuous streams flowing into the Caspian. They were stopped by a countersurge from the sea and driven back into villages and fields. Something had to be sacrificed. The Sabirabad-Salyany highway bore the brunt of the assault by the water deflected by a levee, and, by remaining under water, it saved settlements nearby from being flooded. At first the water was diverted into reservoirs. But they were soon brimful. They started hastily building levees. Not far from the city of Ali-Bayramly one of them saved a cotton gin from being completely inundated. Over a period of a few days nearly 20 kilometers of levees were constructed throughout the disaster area. Bulldozers, excavators, and trucks—all the available equipment of the "Glavazmeliovodstroy" administration—were brought in from the surrounding area. But machinery is not omnipotent. In places where machines cannot go people are bundling together branches and brushwood into faggots, which are then dumped in the water and covered with sandbags.

The damage caused by flooding is preliminarily estimated at R7 million. But, fortunately, there are no casualties. Headquarters to deal with the effects of the disaster have been set up in all the rayons in the flood zone. But the situation remains tense. The water level has fallen only 15 centimeters. Several villages are inaccessible. Over thousands of hectares that are apparently unaffected the water table is rising because of the moisture seeping through.... But it is past experience that gives rise to the gravest fears: The Kura and the Araks are at their most unruly not at the beginning, but at the end of May. So people are preparing for another battle with the elements.

Banned Estonian Flag Shown in Tallin Parade

PM0905160188 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 4 May 88 p 4

[Alex Milits report: "Green Meeting in Tallinn"—all Estonian names as published]

[Text] Last Sunday, 1 May, the Estonian environmentalist movement took part in the public demonstration in Tallinn for the first time, sources in the Estonian capital report.

Civil rights activists from the Estonian Group for the Publication of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact also joined the "greens"' column. They were carrying the banned black, blue, and white Estonian flag and also carried placards with slogans such as "Down with the government of frauds [bedragare]" and "Freedom for Mart Niklus and Enn Tarto." The demonstrators also called for the truth about the death of Juri Kukk.

After the demonstration the "greens" arranged a meeting at the statue to writer Anton Hansen Tammsaare in central Tallinn. Later the dissidents held a meeting at the same spot and around 1,100 people took part. Speeches there reminded the crowd of the death of scientist Juri Kukk in a labor camp in 1981 and recalled that civil rights activists Mart Niklus and Enn Tarto are still being held in camps. The meeting also demanded that the KGB should release Valev Kruusalu, and this happened. [sentence as published]

There are reports from the small town of Voru in southern Estonia that around 2,000 dissidents gathered for a meeting last Sunday. There too the banned Estonian flag and banners calling for a free Estonia and "democratic popular representation" were carried.

Lithuanian Writer Views Nationalities Issues

PM270931 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Apr 88 p 3

[SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent N. Lashkevich interview with Pyatras Brazhenas, first secretary of the Lithuanian SSR Union of Writers Board, under the "Lenin's Legacy and Restructuring" rubric: "Through the National to the International!"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] [Lashkevich] You belong to the cohort of Lithuanian writers who entered the life of great literature from rural life. Indeed, this is the path taken by almost all Lithuanian writers. Consequently you are perfectly well aware of rural problems and modern rural life. However, that will not be the subject of our discussion today and I would like to begin my conversation with you on problems of national relations with the following question: Do you often refer to V.I. Lenin's creative legacy?

[Brazhenas] The point is not how often or seldom I have studied his work, although I have, of course, studied it in more detail and in greater depth recently. It is much more important to answer the question: Why? In the process of democratic transformations after so many years when the most complex problems of national relations were hushed up and when many of Lenin's theses were interpreted arbitrarily, it is important to understand for oneself the essence of Vladimir Ilich's theoretical work on the nationalities question without relying on second-hand quotations. We have, unfortunately, treated Lenin's works extremely freely. We read them selectively and took convenient quotations out of context in order to achieve speculative aims based on considerations of expediency. For example, V.I. Lenin's well known thesis on the need to show particular caution in dealing with national feelings was interpreted one-sidedly and used as an argument for saying nothing at all about the complex problems of national relations in our multinational state. Yet in recent decades we have accumulated more than enough of these problems. It was once considered unseemly to talk about the nationalities question's "sore" points and people were more inclined to write and talk about the nations' allegedly untroubled unity and the peoples' indestructible friendship. In short, "caution" was understood as simple hushing up. Those who tried to pose these problems truthfully and to speak about national self-awareness were, on the basis of the example of certain theorists, categorized as "nationalists" and removed from involvement in public life. Thus different concepts—the national and the nationalist—were lumped together. Stagnant phenomena in society also had a most adverse effect on the substance of national relations—that is indisputable.

[Lashkevich] Glasnost and the democratization of our life are now making it possible for us to talk openly about the social essence of national relations. Discussions and disputes are under way and there is no way of escaping mutual accusations of hurting national feelings. I am afraid that we may have spent too much time talking about this question...

[Brazhenas] You have to speak out. You have to clarify your positions, define and assess the situation, and then take concrete steps. I myself am still unclear on a great many things. So discussions are useful. We need to get over this stage. It's another matter when opponents show their poor level of spiritual culture in the course of discussions and spend more time shouting and sticking labels on people instead of arguing in a reasoned fashion. There is still a great deal left unsaid and unclear. How many "blank spots" there are still in the history of our multinational motherland! How many people there are who "cannot waive their principles," affirming that democratization and glasnost are only intensifying national problems by undermining the bases of socialism! They say that restructuring is to blame for fact that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh cropped up, that the question of the Crimean Tatars has become acute, and that nationalists have reared their heads in the Baltic region....

[Lashkevich] In my opinion, trying to confuse cause and effect is outright demagoguery.

[Brazhenas] Precisely! The acuteness of the present clashes in resolving the problems of national relations is the consequence of an old deep-seated illness which was driven deep underground during the period of the personality cult and the subsequent years of stagnation. The roots of nationalism sprang up on the soil of the alleged lack of conflict, a style of leadership based on administrative orders, and an antidemocratic atmosphere in society, especially in the years when the country was led by Stalin. The slogan of the friendship of the peoples was sometimes not borne out by real practice and this gave rise to a muffled protest which has today assumed the traits of hypertrophied national feeling in some people.

The situation in Lithuania is further exacerbated by the fact that in the course of historical development national feelings (sociologists claim that they are second only to feelings of love in terms of intensity) were exposed to all manner of humiliation and insult. The invasion of the Crusaders, who punished recalcitrant Lithuanian pagans with fire and sword, the union with Poland and subsequent Polonization, the tsarist policy of enforced Russification, the suppression of Lithuanian language and literature, and Stalin's unwarranted repressions... All this must also be kept in mind. This must all be discussed openly and in public. However, it must be discussed without shouting or dilettante attacks, strictly scientifically. Lenin's works may be of tremendous help here. Here is what V.I. Lenin wrote, in particular, in the work

"On the Question of Nationalities or On 'Autonomization'" regarding the need to ensure that what he called "non-Russians'" has as much trust as possible in the proletarian: "For this we must by our treatment or by our concessions to the non-Russian compensate in some way or other for the distrust, the suspicion, and the insults which were inflicted on him in the past by the government of the 'great-power nation.'"

[Lashkevich] The "blank spots" in history undeniably help to charge unhealthy passions around the nationalities question. A small group of "rights defenders" made cunning use of them this February when they tried to broadly celebrate the so-called 70th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. But you will agree that we have by no means fully covered in the press, books, and scientific works the complex paths of Lithuania's history, for instance, the time of postwar collectivization and the struggle against the nationalist underground, when completely innocent people were groundlessly subjected to repression along with real criminals. Poor use is being made of local and central archives. To this day writers have, in my opinion, not fully revealed the underlying and by no means unambiguous layers of history....

[Brazhenas] Inertia of social thinking is having an impact. Yes, so far we have been giving many phases of historical development insufficiently broad and in-depth coverage and this is not helping to resolve the complex problems of national relations. But there are changes for the better. A new systemic course in the history of the Lithuanian SSR will soon be introduced in schools. The Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences History Institute is producing a two-volume academic edition of Lithuanian history. I am profoundly convinced that national history is the window through which to see if not world history then at least the history of the USSR. It will be extremely useful for every nation and ethnic group if each of the peoples inhabiting it goes down in the history of the great Soviet state with its own history. Nor are Lithuanian writers standing on the sidelines. The latest works of Y. Avizhyus, A. Belyauskas, R. Granauskas, P. Dirgela, A. Potsyus, V. Petkyavichyus, and others are confirmation of this. Increasingly often the republic's writers are turning, like their Russian, Belorussian, and Latvian literary colleagues, to journalism and concrete contemporary topics of social resonance. This is a fact of restructuring.

[Lashkevich] At the USSR Union of Writers Plenum you quoted the following sociological data in your speech: Approximately 90 percent of young people aged 16-25 speak fluent Russian. But, unfortunately, I did not find any information on the number of the Russian-speaking population living in the republic who do not speak Lithuanian.

[Brazhenas] I cannot say precisely. I know from personal experience that many people who speak Russian do not study Lithuanian. I would not rush to blame them for this (although it is no secret that there are also people who deliberately do not want to study the language of the people of the republic in which they are living). Alas, we have sometimes failed to display the requisite initiative ourselves The number of Lithuanian language courses for the Russian-speaking population has now increased and a special study program has been organized on television. In short, there are changes. But we need to tackle in earnest the study of our native language. Of course, we are not faced with the same linguistic problems as, say, the Belorussians and the Ukrainians. However, we also need to constantly study the language and its social function. I am sure that only in-depth study of the structure of one's native language creates the preconditions for an equally in-depth knowledge of another language. Otherwise man will not know a single language properly. Incidentally, how did you study Lithuanian?

[Lashkevich] At school and the VUZ... But to be frank, I learned little there. Whereas direct social contacts...

[Brazhenas] That is why we need to radically change the system of teaching Lithuanian in schools and VUZ's. And, indeed, the teaching of Russian in Lithuanian schools. You have probably encountered cases of people in the heart of the countryside having a poor knowledge of Russian?

[Lashkevich] Yes, I have. Especially in those areas where the Russian-speaking population is small...

[Brazhenas] That is the cost of our education system, which is characteristic not only of Lithuania but also of other republics. Restructuring has revealed many of our "defects." The linguistic barrier often becomes a social barrier, a "stumbling block" for the representatives of the different peoples. This is the source of many misunderstandings right down to extremist outbursts.

[Lashkevich] The growing sense of national self-awareness in the process of restructuring has led us to resolve difficult problems which were previously assiduously hushed up. In particular, ecological problems in the country's individual regions, which used to be resolved by all manner of departments acting to the detriment of national interests, have been highlighted more boldly under glasnost. At the same time under conditions of the democratization of society, the essence of internationalism has been revealed in a new light. For instance, the letter defending the Kurskiy Gulf against the "oil boom" planned by departments was signed not only by Lithuanian writers and scientific and cultural figures, but also by representatives of other nationalities....

[Barzhenas] That's natural. We breathe the same air and live on the same earth. The tragedy of Chernobyl is the tragedy not only of our Ukrainian and Belorussian friends but also that of the Lithuanian people. The pain of Baykal is our pain. Ecology has become the basis for the manifestation of internationalism. We are concerned about the Ignalina AES which some half-wit proposed constructing in one of Lithuania's conservation areas. In the Ignalina area, which is rich in woods and lakes.

[Lashkevich] But I recently read in a republican newspaper that the ecological situation in the Ignalina AES zone is normal and that there is no cause for alarm....

[Brazhenas] ...Just as there is no cause for complacency. The public must keep a strict eye on the ecological situation everywhere. Including at AES's where parochial interests must not be allowed to exist in peace.

Internationalism is thus being filled with new content in the restructuring process. Today we are all linked by strong economic ties. I cannot, for example, conceive the republic's agriculture without Belorussian tractors and Russian combines. But the resolution of national problems of a social nature is no less important: linguistic, ecological, and historical problems. I have a concrete proposal: There is an urgent need to create an All-Union Scientific Center for Problems of National Relations. Provided, however, that it does not engage in pseudoscientific activity and does not propagate recommendations and instructions, but carries out extensive research work with a view to implementing a more flexible nationalities policy within the framework of our multinational state. The policy bequeathed to us by V.I. Lenin.

Participants View Conference on Religion

PM1005093988 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 May 88 p 7

[Karen Stepanyan report: "Beginning of a Dialogue"]

[Text] A scientific-practical conference on "The History of Russian Culture and the Christian Tradition" has been held in Moscow.

It was organized by the Dzerzhinskiy CPSU Raykom, the All-Union "Znaniye" Society's Central House of Scientific Atheism, and the Council for Work With the Creative Intelligentsia.

"Spiritual and religious traditions are part of our cultural past. Unless we know them we will be unable to build the future," R. Rybakov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Oriental Studies Institute and chairman of the conference's organizing committee, declared on opening the conference. "This conference, devoted to the millennium of Russia's baptism and the forthcoming bimillenium of the emergence of Christianity, marks the beginning of a new stage in the study of these traditions."

It cannot be denied that the conference program was extremely rich: reports on "The History of Russian Culture and the Christian Tradition" (V. Yanin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences), "The Humanism and Esthetic Value of the Monuments of Ancient Russian Painting and Architecture" (Prof A. Kozarzhevskiy), "The Problem of Man in Orthodox Religious Awareness" (Doctor of Philological Sciences, Prof P. Gurevich); work in three sections on "Problems of Culture in Marxism and Christianity," "Politics and Religion," and "Art and Religion"; and a "roundtable discussion" on "Christian Religion in Socialist Countries." To be honest, though, the application of new approaches to the problems raised was by no means manifest in all of the numerous reports and speeches. This gave rise to the question which I asked some participants: "What do you see as the main innovative feature of today's conference?"

"We should be talking not about a main innovative feature but rather about a continuation—a continuation of the lofty traditions of humanitarian science, of genuinely scientific atheism, which have always existed in our country although, admittedly, for a long time they coexisted with and were even overshadowed by vulgar sociological approaches and clamorous and vacuous books and brochures," replied R. Rybakov. "The importance of this conference lies in the fact that we are taking the first step along the long path of renewal which our religious studies are now undergoing."

"To draw an analogy with the name of the street where our conference is being held—Malomoskovskaya—it can be said that so far the dominant thinking and approach has been slightly new [malo-novyy]," Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof M. Kapustin told me. "Today we are talking about trust, about the need for dialogue between the most implacable ideological adversaries, but we have still not overcome the antagonism between scientific atheists and theologians, and the fault lies squarely with us. Even at this conference we've 'managed' without inviting any theologian representatives. The effect of inertia. And yet such a dialogue between equals would have been extremely useful today. We have not learned to extract the rational kernels from theological thinking, especially from the contribution which Christian culture has made to world culture—the discovery of 'inner' man."

"I disagree with my colleague," said Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof V. Zots, chief of department at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Higher Party School. "The innovative feature of this conference is obvious to me. It is primarily the dispersal of the aura of infallibility from scientific atheism. For years on end we did not argue but quarreled with religion. Now we are gradually embarking on a dialogue. I am pleased to report that the open dialogues with believers which we launched recently in Belaya Tserkov near Kiev (as reported by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 13 January) are continuing and generating tremendous interest among people. The new approach is also manifest in relations with our opponents abroad: Not all of them are unfriendly, and many have, alas, a better knowledge of our culture than we do."

"I must admit that I did not perceive any fundamentally new approach on the first day of the conference's work," declared G. Proshin, chief of department at the State Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. "But, of course, the change in tone toward religion is exceptionally important. We have at long last ceased to follow the instruction: Religion is bad for this and that reason, so get on with it and prove it. We have started to think, to study, to conduct scientific quests, and to cooperate with believers, who are equal citizens of our country."

Trawlermen Fined for Illegal Far East Fishing
PM0905093588 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 4 May 88 p 2

[I. Khakimov "Urgent Alert" report: "Poachers on the Continental Shelf"—paragraph in boldface italics as published]

[Text] ***Kamchatka Oblast—Our newspaper has already reported the difficulties which a Bering Sea expedition experienced this spring. The large trawler-freezer "Mys Bobrova" was trapped in heavy ice, holed, and sunk. This tragic case is just one in a series of unpleasant events.***

Sailing away from the ice field, the fleet of large ships found itself next to Karaginskiy Bay, which is closed to the fishing industry. Overflying this prohibited zone, "Kamchatrybvod" inspectors detected there in just 3 days eight large freezer ships and supertrawlers belonging to the "Primorrybprom," "Sakhalinrybprom," and "Kamchatrybprom" Associations. Anticipating overflights by airborne inspectors, some of the crews had hung canvas over their ships' identification signs.

The violators were fined, the navigators had their personal fishing tickets canceled, and they were banned from fishing for 1 year.

Why are fishermen committing blatant violations? The point is that Far Eastern Basin Fishing Industry Main Administration planning organs set clearly impossible targets for expedition ships, disregarding the perennial extremely difficult ice conditions and the declining fish stocks in the industry's traditional fishing zones. And so the fishermen strive to sneak secretly over the continental shelf, which is rich in shoals.

The consequences of poaching are catastrophic: The largest of supertrawlers, designed to work in far-flung areas of ocean, very quickly turn the densely populated underwater slopes into a bare and lifeless seabed.

Availability of Churbanov Book Protested
PM0905153588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 7 May 88 p 1

[Reader's Letter under the general heading "What People Think!": "On the Works of Yu.M. Churbanov"]

[Text] V. Rosin, a CPSU member since 1943, writes from Kiev:

As is well known, former USSR First Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Churbanov was arrested for bribery on a particularly large scale and other official crimes. His name has become synonymous with corruption, dishonor, and baseness.

Imagine my surprise when I came across Churbanov's work "Political-Educational Work in Internal Affairs Organs" (Moscow, 1982) in the book fund catalogue for issue to readers. Can it really still be necessary to study the works of a jailed degenerate?

Publishing Statistics Released on Press Day
LD0505095388 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 5 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—The Soviet Union is second to none in the world as regards the number of newspapers printed in one day. Last year 19 million more people subscribed to newspapers and magazines. More than 8,000 newspapers, with the single print run of 180 million copies, and more than 1,500 magazines are issued today. They are published in 55 languages of the peoples of the USSR, journalists were told at the USSR State Committee for Printing, Publishing and Book Trade, on the Day of the Press, which is marked annually in the Soviet Union on May 5, when the first issue of the newspaper PRAVDA, founded by Lenin, was published in St Petersburg in 1912.

It was noted at the meeting that the publishing industry had gained a wide scope in the USSR. The country has 219 publishing houses and 4,000 printing establishments which put out annually more than two billion books and pamphlets. Fiction accounts for more than a half of these publications.

Perestroyka, under way in the USSR, also affected the publishing trade. A number of important decisions have been taken recently. Publishing houses, for example, received a right themselves to compile and approve the book printing schedules. The readers' demand is being studied better. Publishing books at the authors' expense is being used more widely. Heads of the publishing houses become more often elected and not appointed.

Moscow is the country's largest publishing centre, with 71 publishing houses and 120 printing establishments. Newspapers in the capital are printed in more than 21,000 million copies every year.

New Soviet Literary Journal Editor Interviewed
PM190923 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 88 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with Vladimir Ognev, chairman of the USSR Writers Union Board Council for Literature of Socialist Countries and chief editor of the literary and artistic review GORIZONT, by Ye. Spekhov: "'Honest Confusion of the Mind....' Conversation With a Critic About Friends' Literatures"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] My interlocutor is Vladimir Ognev, author of many books about poetry—Soviet and foreign. For 15 years he was in charge of the Writers Union "roundtable" on problems of the socialist countries' literature. He knows about them not by hearsay. He reads all the Slavic languages and German. The writer has a taste for our friends' literature and a long-standing attachment to them. The sincere lines of the just published book "Through the Eyes of Memory" [Glazami Pamyati] speak with feeling of Gyula Illyes, Nicolas Guillen, Wladyslaw Broniewski, Leon Kruczkowski, Jaroslaw Iwaszkiewicz, Laco Novomesky, and Branko Copic.

Vladimir Ognev is now chairman of the USSR Writers Union Board Council for Literature of Socialist Countries and chief editor of the literary and artistic review GORIZONT [Horizon]. It will publish the best works by the socialist countries' writers.

[Spekhov] Why precisely GORIZONT?

[Ognev] Not the best name for a review? I think otherwise. It is accurate. What gives cause for concern in our literary life, in the literary round, so to speak? Narrowness of outlook, pettiness. There are arguments about all sorts of things, which frequently escalate into squabbles. But what Blok called the "music of revolution" and what progressive artists of all times have called a "state of peace" hardly finds expression either in the press or at forums. Amazing!

World culture today is developing in the close interaction of progressive currents and trends of different national cultures. The 20th century is increasingly imperiously teaching us to resolve not only national and regional tasks but also universal tasks common to all mankind. The emphasis has today been placed on the growing tendency toward the interdependence of the states of the world community because "the problem of mankind's survival could prove insoluble." But this emphasis is in itself a revolution in consciousness. It is futile to think that the equilibrium of, for example, the national and the universal can be manifested harmoniously and without conflict already tomorrow. We do, alas, know of examples which are, rather, of the opposite kind, including under socialist relations. And when we speak of our people's international education, we cannot fail to place this appeal in the context of general concern on the global scale of the world community of nations. Internationalism today is more than just the friendship of peoples. It is the cementing principle of peace on the planet. This is another reason why the name GORIZONT is dear to me.

[Spekhov] And what is the role of socialist literature in resolving universal tasks common to all mankind?

[Ognev] I would reply in this way. Socialist literatures do not lose primacy or yield positions when they head the universal front of the struggle against the threat of world catastrophe. On the contrary, they contribute to socialism's attractiveness as the most peaceful social system on earth. I am convinced that there is no more dangerous illusion today than diehard sectarianism, be it national or class-based.

[Spekhov] Here we are approaching changes in the spiritual sphere, in the literature of certain socialist countries—changes signifying the elaboration of the new thinking. A very difficult task. In each country these changes are interpreted by writers in their own way, in the general flow of the processes taking place both in society and in literature....

[Ognev] The new thinking is conquering the world. Life itself is inexorably demanding radically new approaches to many "stagnation" phenomena in relations among peoples and states. It is natural that the world of socialism (and it above all!) cannot go on living in the old way. I will venture an "heretical" thought: Capitalism might have learned the truth about renewal a little earlier and has shown the ability to improve its system itself. From our viewpoint, it has not become better. Only it is skillfully ridding itself—albeit only for a while—of a number of the contradictions of its internal structure. We believe in socialism's strategic goal, but tactically we have not always proved equal to it.... Now the internal opponents of restructuring, trying to intimidate us with various "misfortunes," do not understand that socialism is not a dogma but a living process. The people have outgrown the politics of dogmatists. It is obsolete. The party has realized this. The new thinking is inseparable from the democratization of society, where glasnost is an important means of going over to new forms of socialist democracy and, simultaneously, inwardly freeing souls subjected to deformations of a moral nature. If you like, it is a question of the indivisibility of the concepts of "socialism" and "morality."

[Spekhov] This process is taking place in different ways in the various socialist countries. Both because of the unevenness of historical development and for reasons of national distinctiveness and traditions.

[Ognev] That is understandable. But you should not think that these are the only reasons. In addition to objective reasons, there are also subjective ones. Opponents of the new course will not call themselves opponents. Time and the logic of life will eliminate them. But the process of elimination will be difficult. Each socialist country taken separately will have its own arguments for applying the brakes and its own original forms of defending conservatism and bureaucratic usages. The opponents of reforms sometimes call the defense of these usages "principles" which they, you see, cannot forgo. Incidentally, we have already been through all this. Repeatedly. Only it would not be a bad thing to remember these lines of A. Tvardovskiy's:

"Seek not everywhere ambushes,
"Scare not from behind the bushes.

"Give it up. Those times are gone.

"Like it or not, they have now gone!"

A decisive demarcation between progressive and conservative elements is also taking place in the cultural sphere. Nothing can be achieved here with calls for fraternization. The fundamental unity of the ideal demands clarity. The sooner the masks are torn from the faces of yesterday's demagogues, the more certain it is there will be no demagogues today.

[Spekhov] But does it not seem to you that the sharp "demarcation" of the intelligentsia could upset the unity of the socialist society's ranks? Is this not what our system's enemies are really gambling on?

[Ognev] The demarcation is carried out by life, not by some malefactors. The chief thing is not to nod beyond the "knoll" but to do your own thing with merit. More faith in socialism, in its internal forces and reserves. And the enemy's gamble? He would rejoice most of all at the failure of restructuring and the loss of the people's faith in socialism. And it is only in this grim way that the question stands.

I recently read in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA an article by the Polish diplomat Wladyslaw Klaczynski under the very significant title "The Truth Never Got in the Way Before." He writes: Who is to be taken into account in our press articles—an opponent whom we were for a long time reluctant to let in on our difficulties, or a reader who has lived through them with us but found in our press not only no answers but also no allusions to them?

[Spekhov] Here the diplomat is addressing, rather, the mass media and their mastering of the new style. We writers are dominated by the thought: "God forbid that we be accused of interfering in a particular country's internal affairs." Some people regard a truthful press article almost as a disaster. It can happen that even friends are offended.... The press has its tasks and its role. We are speaking of changes in the socialist countries' literatures. Which new features would you note in their development in past years?

[Ognev] There are many. I will name two. The dramatic nature of the development of history and the intensity of the passions of the age of wars and revolutions. Let us take prose. Romanian prose, for example. The formation of socialism, the path to which lay by way of surmounting national and religious dissension (Zaharia Stancu's "Uruma"), the bloody conflicts of World War II with its difficult development of the person's new consciousness (Laurentsiu Fulga's "Outcome" and Titus Popovici's "Death of Ipu"), and the class stratification of the nation in the Romanian countryside (Ion Lancrajan's "Silently" and Andrash Suto's "Stubborn Lukacs"). Here parallels suggest themselves with the works of Ch. Aytmatov, V. Bykov, V. Rasputin, S. Zalygin, and B. Mozhayev.

I would also call books of national self-criticism, so to speak, an important direction in literature in recent years. If you take Hungarian prose, for example, there is Tibor Cseres' novel "Cold Days," and in Romanian there is Laurentsiya Fulga's "Without Glory" and "Alexandra and Hell." In them there is a sincere, passionate craving to atone for the guilt of the unjust social system which forced nations to fight on the side of fascist Germany.

But national self-criticism—speaking more broadly—is the lot of any literature that is concerned about society's development along the path of progress. Here Soviet culture today is worthily setting an example of respect for the historical truth.

But to return to the question of truth in literature. Laszlo Sandor, the Hungarian publicist, remarked that "prickly" truthful works by Hungarian writers who "speak profoundly and frankly" of what is good and bad in life are published in the West but "do not always reach the Soviet reader." It turns out, all the same, that you cannot keep the truth under wraps. And is there any need to? It is time to state the chief point: Only genuine talents and artists who carry weight and authority in a national culture can be of serious interest for translation. But we paid a generous tribute to a different principle: We propagandized and published nonauthoritative authors who easily went along with any situation.

[Spekhov] How do things stand with our publishing of the best works by authors from the socialist countries?

[Ognev] They are published belatedly. Many years behind Western countries, and that is with the publication of a number of works by leading artists of the socialist world. Why has Vasko Popa, who has been published throughout the world, been accorded this honor in our country last of all? Here is something I do not understand: Why did it take decades to persuade our publishers to find room in their plans for the classics—Milos Crnjanski, Gyula Illyes, and Miroslav Krleza?

We must abandon the superficial, comforting idea that the socialist countries' literatures are supposedly some kind of monolith. Some publishers are convinced that it is generally easier to work with writers of the socialist community than with Western writers. No, there are problems and internal conflicts here.

One of the most substantial "whys" is a question which still appears finicky to many of us. Why, on the wave of every stage, when grim political circumstances are accompanied by a hardening in the sphere of cultural policy, do opportunists and mediocrities at once appear on the surface, gladly taking the place of talented people? "Lessings" of grayness and mediocrity and demagogues who loudly shout about their loyalty and readiness to "conform" come to light here. And is it not time to seriously analyze this process too?

Revolutionary processes are always dramatic. And not all stages in the development of culture have their Lunacharskiys. But clear and definite conclusions have to be drawn from history: We would have avoided many misfortunes, and many destinies of great artists would have turned out more happily, if we had learned to distinguish the honest confusion of a great mind, even its historical delusions, and the obsequious assenting of timeservers to any idea. In the first instance we have before us the difficult paths of the development of talent and, perhaps, an insight achieved with difficulty. In the second—the profanation of socialism and lingering harm to socialist culture. In my opinion, Stephan Hermlin, a senior GDR writer, communist writer, underground fighter during the times of fascism, internationalist, and participant in the fighting in Spain, was right when, in his speech opening the last GDR writers' congress, he raised the question of sharing responsibility in such a painful issue as the drain of brains and talents. He was also right when he called "prohibition" in the cultural sphere a survival of "wartime communism in culture."

[Spekhov] What is the essence of the work concept of the Writers' Council for Literatures of Socialist Countries?

[Ognev] We propose, above all, to change the climate of contacts, to reject the mutually unacceptable "condescension," as Hermann Kant said in conversation with me, and to assert a mutually exacting attitude to the standard of literature. Laszlo Sandor's words can only be lamented: You sometimes see a good, sincere Soviet movie in a half-empty theater. Another time an excellent Soviet book...gathers dust in a book depot. And you may wonder: Why? Laszlo Sandor says: What is to blame, above all, is the "leveling" of past years....

[Spekhov] "Leveling" in what?

[Ognev] For years reviewers lavished compliments on very mediocre works, as though afraid to break the rules of protocol. Such criticism, having lost trust, today cannot correctly orientate the audience....

There is no difference, you know, between criteria on our domestic literary front and the external front. If quality criteria are so flawed that it is possible to read that a mediocrity is a "classic of Soviet literature," then it is possible, as was done in the volume of the Library of World Literature devoted to the socialist countries' poetry, to miss a number of Yugoslavia's best poets.... The business of familiarizing readers in socialist countries with Soviet literature is organized still less discriminatingly.

[Spekhov] I don't know about others, but grayness maintains all-around defense concertedly, "internationally...."

[Ognev] But this is a separate topic. Our friends decide what and how to publish, and that is correct. There is nothing uglier than mysterious lists of recommended writers, whichever officials draw them up and on whose part.

[Spekhov] How was your report on the creation of the literary and artistic review GORIZONT received at the conference of leaders of the socialist countries' writers unions?

[Ognev] It was greeted with friendly support. People want to subscribe to it. They are sending materials. However, the so-called elaboration of the economic potential, references to paper quotas, and bureaucratic games according to a principle long since tried and tested—"chase the hare further"—have already lasted several months. Two issues have been set up along voluntary lines. The "Progress" and "Khudozhestvennaya Literatura" Publishing Houses are ready to publish, but...the periodicity of publication is holding things up. And a distant time is being cited—1990.... The review's editorial board, which includes Ch. Aytmatov, A. Voznesenskiy, D. Granin, R. Gamzatov, Yu. Chernichenko, Yu. Karyakin, and other litterateurs, is at a loss: In our time do we really have to demonstrate the priority nature of this kind of publication?

It is time the review of the socialist countries' literatures became an active part of Soviet periodical publishing.

Kiev Reader Bemoans Local Press Footdragging

PM0905113188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 May 88 Second Edition p 1

["Press Day" readers' letters feature under general headline "The Barometer of Glasnost"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpt] On the eve of Press Day the number of letters about newspapers and newspapermen in the editorial mailbag has increased. Readers are unanimous: "Reading newspapers has become more interesting." This is also borne out by subscriptions for periodical publications: Their circulation has increased by 19.7 million copies in 1988.

The Test of Time [subhead]

If in Moscow the barometer of glasnost is pointing to gale, in some union republic capitals it merely causes breakers, in oblast centers a gentle ripple, and as for rayons, there is a dead calm. In my opinion, the further away from Moscow you get, the more the level of glasnost changes—in the wrong direction.

There is no need to look far for examples. The most critical articles about administrative ambitions, serious violations of official duties by certain leading comrades, lack of objectivity and prejudice in examining working people's petitions and complaints, and, last but not least, violations of socialist legality at many places in the Ukraine have appeared on the pages of central rather than republic publications.

Let us recall the case of A. Chabanov, director of the Cherkassy "Rotor" plant, or the Voroshilovgrad, Dnepropetrovsk, or Lvov affairs... It was the Moscow rather than the Kiev press which spoke out loudly about the serious shortcomings in the work of these party committees.

Yet, how many Chabanovs are still silenced under the gaze of envious people, how many difficulties have to be coped with by people who think and act in an unorthodox fashion? Let the Ukrainian press come more actively to the defense of people who are struggling for restructuring. We will not criticize them for it, on the contrary, we will help and support it and take the necessary steps.

What are we afraid of? The test of glasnost? It is futile! It is necessary to do more to ensure that at all times and in all things glasnost acts in its true form as glasnost, without provincial makeup or sugar-coating.

At present, in connection with the democratization of our life, with the new stage of the radical economic reform, it is especially in the provinces that the debate is rising and growing more exacerbated, that processes natural in circumstances of this kind are taking place, and in the struggle between the new that is gaining ground and the old that is refusing to give way. And the local press should pick up these processes sensitively, thoughtfully investigate and analyze the forms of this struggle, rather than wait until the post delivers a newspaper or journal page from Moscow editorial offices which grateful readers will photocopy and pass from hand to hand.

L. Korenevich, CPSU member since 1965, Kiev. [passage omitted]

'Democracy' Program on Press, Restructuring

LD0605131088 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1525 GMT on 5 May carries a 40-minute discussion entitled "We're Learning Democracy: the Press and Restructuring" introduced by correspondent V. Makeyev with Viktor Grigoriyevich Afanasyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and PRADVA chief editor; Nikolay Nikolayevich Chetveriko, chairman of the board of the All-Union Copyright Agency; and Vladimir Dmitriyevich Nadein, editor of IZVESTIYA's letters department. It is filmed at the PRAVDA editorial office and is intercut with film reports on the affairs of different newspapers throughout the country.

The program opens with a filmed interview with the editor of the rayon newspaper NOVOYA KOLYMA in Magadan Oblast, who describes how, following a campaign run by the paper criticizing malpractices in the trade network, unfinished construction projects, and the work of the local law enforcement bodies, an anonymous letter against the paper resulted in a militia investigation. The letter, which accused the newspaper staff of misusing public funds, proved to be "slander."

Makeyev, who chairs the discussion, is shown seated at a table with the other participants.

"[Makeyev] Viktor Grigoriyevich, today readers are passing their verdict on the press. We see this in large print-runs for newspapers and magazines and lines at the newstand as people look for controversial articles. As chairman of the USSR Union of Journalists, do you share the view that journalism is on the right track?

"[Afanasyev] We have succeeded in carrying out a certain amount of stock-taking regarding our affairs. We have been successful in criticizing shortcomings, mistakes, and errors; we have been successful in our search for certain historical facts; we have made certain amplifications to our history and rendered it in more specific terms. So in all probability we have coped with the critical aspect of our work.

"But the second stage of restructuring is now underway. It is a stage at which the policies and strategy of restructuring, its forms and methods, must be put into practice. The second stage is the stage of practical implementation of the theory, strategy, and policy of restructuring formulated by the party. In this area we have not yet attained the level that restructuring demands. We have not yet restructured ourselves sufficiently here. We have not yet undergone enough of a relearning process, because new problems now face us which we did not deal with before: for instance, the problems of commodity-money relations, individual labor activity, or mixed enterprises. I could list dozens of such problems for you.

"But it seems to me—and not just me—that it is most important now to seek out the progressive experience of restructuring, the people, and the collectives of restructuring. We must support this experience, we must disseminate progressive experience, but, of course, with no relaxation in the critical thrust of our press and its concern with controversial problems. That is what we are currently working on."

Video shows miscellany of newspaper articles with headlines such as "What Was It?—Thoughts on the Events of Yerevan," "More Glasnost, More Democracy, More Socialism—a Letter to PRAVDA," "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action—Reaction to the Editorial Article."

"[Makeyev] Viktor Grigoriyevich, a debate is underway in society at present on many issues concerning our lives. This is natural, and it seems to me that it is one of the most important gains of democracy, which is gaining breadth and depth.

"[Afanasyev] It seems to me that the atmosphere of debate is not just a natural thing: it is also essential for us today. It is essential because in these difficult circumstances of restructuring when restructuring has its opponents, when there are factors applying the brakes, and when there are also a good many positive solutions, there must be a comparison of opinions, alternative solutions to individual problems must be presented, these alternatives must be assessed, and the best ones chosen. I believe we cannot do without debate, discussion, or coverage of controversial problems.

"[Nadein] To be precise, there must be debate among journalists.

"[Afanasyev] There must be debate among journalists, too. Look at this: two newspapers of the party Central Committee, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and our PRAVDA are in actual fact engaged in a debate. This is an unprecedented occurrence. I think there is nothing in that to give offense.

"[Nadein] And these papers are situated literally 20 meters from each other.

"[Afanasyev] Yes, they're 20 meters from each other.

"[Makeyev] I have in front of me the issue of PRAVDA in which readers' reactions to the editorial article, "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Nature of Thought and Action," were published. But it seems to me that the selection of letters, expressing full unanimity, is not quite accurate, because there are no doubt readers who agree with some of the points made in the article, if not all of it, then at least certain points.

"[Afanasyev] In the selection of letters you've got there we did not just take the supporters of restructuring, but supporters who raise some kind of problems, questions for debate or suggestions, or who criticize something. So it cannot be said that even that selection is totally and utterly in favor. The fact is that there are a good deal of problems raised by our readers in their letters while supporting the PRAVDA editorial article.

"[Nadein] It seems to me that on no account should the discussion be about the personality of Nina Andreyeva, who acted quite properly in conveying her views, her opinion, and her standpoint to others. However much we may try, we won't see anything reprehensible in her act of frankly stating her views in the papers. Equally, it seems to me, it is scarcely worth our while judging PRAVDA by whether many or few positive or adverse reactions were published. In essence, a paper only fulfills its duty if it properly reflects public opinion. And I believe that public opinion today overwhelmingly agrees with the points set out in the PRAVDA editorial article. It seems to me that the article is amazingly accurate in calling the standpoint reflected in Nina Andreyeva's letter a manifesto of antirestructuring forces. And if people join in with that assessment, it is natural that they should reflect their feelings and opinions in the appropriate way. In my view, any attempt to set up arguments and counterarguments artifically is a rather childish journalistic device. There is something more serious: a correct reflection of public opinion. A paper's most worthy role in fulfilling its social function is probably to be a mirror of public opinion, not a distorting mirror, but a faithfully reflecting one. So if the editorial office receives an overwhelming majority of reactions approving the editorial article, it has a straight duty to publish those views. Otherwise, we will not learn what we think, what society thinks about itself. And considering that the article had such repercussions, it is very important that our reflection of views is presented to readers as correctly as possible, irrespective of possible accusations of bias. Accuracy, I repeat, is more important in this context than probable accusations of one-sidedness.

"[Afanasyev] In our reactions we are not attacking the author of the letter to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA or anything, but since this woman, the author of the letter, actually exists, our readers, those who write letters to us, have to mention her surname whether they want to or not. But they don't accuse her of anything in actual fact.

"[Nadein] Naturally so.

"[Chetverikov] We were talking just now about questions of truthfulness and trustworthiness: these questions concern readers. We really must see on the pages of the mass news media information that is sincere, truthful and trustworthy and that does not arouse any doubt as to these aspects. Regrettably, however, not all journalists, and sometimes maybe not all the news media adhere to the rules of journalistic ethics, our Soviet journalistic ethics. There have been, and there continue to be, violations of these rules. A disregard for these rules and mistakes are the result. In connection with this, last March at the proposal of delegates the Sixth Congress of the Union of Soviet Journalists set up an all-union council for professional ethics and the law in order to give these aspects greater attention.

"Now that we're on the subject of the council. I'd like to tell you of the second area of its work, its legal activity. When we say that Soviet journalists sometimes contravene ethics, what happens is that they are subject to action by individual persons, which includes actions being initiated against them in the courts. I know that there are proceedings against PRAVDA.

"[Afanasyev] We are currently involved in 12 court actions.

"[Chetverikov] PRAVDA is involved in 12 legal actions. You will remember in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA....

"[Makeyev, interrupting] Are these cases against the newspaper, or against journalists?

"[Chetverikov] Against journalists, but the press organ which published the journalist's article has the right to answer for and on behalf of the journalist.

"You may remember that MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA carried a report that in the October-November period alone they were involved in six legal actions. The main thing is this: if they are justified actions, that is one thing. We must view matters objectively. But sometimes there are unjustified actions.

"[Afanasyev] They are unjustified as a rule. Most of them are unjustified.

"[Chetverikov] The good name of journalists is slandered. And when this happens, the journalists ask us: All right, we must adhere unconditionally to our Soviet journalistic ethics, but how can the honor and good name of Soviet journalists be protected when they are slandered, and, what is more, prosecuted in the courts, and, when these cases are heard, the slanderers are practically not called to any account subsequently? This is the paradox. And we do not intend to lend greater significance to legal aspects in the work of our council."

A film highlights the case of an engineer who criticized malpractices at his enterprise in the SOVETSKAYA CHUVASHIYA newspaper. The public prosecutor of the Chuvash ASSR said in an interview it was difficult to prove cases of alleged victimization arising from criticism from below. The editor of SOVETSKAYA CHUVASHIYA said journalists should be more versed in legal matters in order to be prepared for similar cases in the future.

"[Makeyev] We know that the stream of readers' letters to IZVESTIYA's editorial office has also increased. What problems are readers raising?

"[Nadein] If I may, I should like to cite an excerpt from a letter I have brought with me. Comrade Korolev writes from Grodno that there is no glasnost, democratization, or restructuring locally. I should like to express the following reservation. Where letters are involved, I do not intend to amend what people say. They frequently put things in extreme terms in order to make their emotions understood. So let us not treat this as a document, but as an expression of personal views: [Nadein is shown reading letter] So, there is no glasnost, democratization, or restructuring. Attitudes toward this are the same as attitudes to corn under Khrushchev. Locally, the powers that be are waiting, and maybe not just waiting, for things to change, as they changed when Khrushchev was replaced. And when that happens, all of you—he means journalists—and we too, will find the going very tough. You must mobilize all resources to ensure that this does not happen.

"That is the first point. I should also like to quote a letter from Comrade Perov in Sosnovskiy Rayon, Chelyabinsk Oblast, who is even more categorical about the contents of the newspapers. He writes: Two newspapers are usually published in every large town: one the organ of the party obkom, and the other, as a rule, an evening paper: well, they can be organs of the party gorkom.

"[Afanasyev] There are also Komsomol newspapers.

"[Nadein] Yes, Komsomol newspapers. [Nadein continues to read letter] Their poverty of content is known to everyone. Harsh control by local functionaries, and sometimes by senior editors afraid of losing their comfortable jobs, takes its toll. Their gags have been taken away, but their hands remain tied, and it cannot be ruled out that fear that all this will come to no good continues to operate. In conditions of glasnost such newspapers do not meet the demands of the times and stay afloat only through the parochial curiosity of the readers and their hopes that the newspapers will improve. Lenin's ISKRA demonstrated more than convincingly what revolutionary reforms a newspaper is capable of. Is it not time to make at least one of the newspapers in the oblast centers a free newspaper operating on a commercial basis and responsible perhaps to the Union of Journalists rather than an organ of the party committees?

"Of course, this is a more than debatable question, it is more than debatable. But I just want to say that restructuring is today teaching us not to brush aside any of the problems that arise."

Over video of people lining up at a newspaper kiosk, the voice-over says: "More than 8,000 newspapers are published in our country. They have a combined print-run of over 180 million. Nevertheless, the lines at the Soyuzpechat kiosks form long before they open. It may be that newspaper print-runs are not growing as rapidly as one would like. Or it may be that the readers want to buy everything that is available. Paradoxical though it is, many newspapers and magazines have recently found themselves in short supply." The film shows interviews with people in the street asking for their views of the press.

Back at the PRAVDA offices Nadein says it is "not quite natural" to force papers to fit into the strict geographical hierarchy represented by the central, republican, oblast and rayon press. He says republican papers are not always available in Moscow. Nadein adds: "Last year we published a lengthy article called "Confessions of a Provincial Journalist." Ala Yaroshinskaya, an ordinary journalist from Zhitomir, described her feelings. She wrote about how she disagreed with her colleagues and how she agreed with them. We received a large number of reactions, from journalists, among others. At the same time, it must be said that the staff at the Zhitomir newspaper adopted a very unfavorable attitude toward the article in the central press by their young colleague. First, they started to seek specific shortcomings and make inaccurate assessments, which were of a very generalized nature. I don't want to discuss them here.

"The main point is that even we journalists frequently regard washing our dirty linen in public as a violation of ethical norms, rather than as normal, democratic intercourse within a society which does not recognize any barriers preventing access to individual enterprises, individual kolkhozes, or individual editorial offices. Washing our dirty linen in public is no doubt a bad thing in terms of form, but in its essence it ought to be an opportunity for democratic intercourse among members of society.

"[Afanasyev] Otherwise, our dirty linen won't be clean.

"[Nadein] Of course, otherwise none of our dirty linen will be clean."

A film describes how a rayon newspaper in Ivanovo Oblast published an open letter from a local weaver about poor conditions at the mill where she worked, resulting in a response from a minister, thus showing that the papers are "instruments of glasnost."

"[Nadein] I should like to continue by saying that we need protection for the journalist, as well as protection from journalists. The existence of clause seven of the civil code which allows the citizen to apply to the courts is a very important and precious asset. But it is also the case that this is very often used by dishonest people taking undue advantage of the fact that an application to the courts costs nothing. For literally R3 you can get the satisfaction of tormenting a major newspaper for half a year."

Chetverikov cites the Russian scholar, Lomonosov, on the responsibilities of the journalist.

Afanasyev concludes by saying: "I should like to express best wishes to all our journalists on both local and central newspapers on our holiday. I'd like to wish them greater boldness, greater robustness, greater accuracy and trustworthiness in their writings, to put things crudely. And, of course, I'd like to wish them good health and every success."

Conference of Prosecutor's Office Aides Held

PM1005080988 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 88 p 1

[N. Boyarkina report: "Two-Day Conference of Members of City and Rayon Prosecutor's Offices Held in the USSR Prosecutor's Office Several Days Ago. Prosecutors Without Lawyers"]

[Text] Regardless of whether we personally have ever had anything to do with transgressions of the law, the courts, or the Public Prosecutor's Office, the work of law enforcement organs is a source of interest to everyone. If a newspaper carries only a tiny article under the rubric "From the Courtroom," its readers will not pass it by—they will read it from beginning to end.

People live by faith in justice. Their lives are filled with optimism when this faith finds support and is based on real cases where truth triumphs and emerges the victor.

Opinions on the progress made by restructuring in Prosecutor's Office work and on its difficulties and successes were going to be given by people who daily come into contact with the real dramas of human life rather than by legal experts.

A.M. Rekunkov, USSR general prosecutor, opened and chaired the conference. From the very outset the prosecutor tried to set a friendly tone for the forthcoming discussion. He warned people that he did not want to listen to prepared speeches and particularly did not want to hear self-praise about work done so far. The general prosecutor asked people to talk candidly about painful issues and about matters that control bodies "above" would possibly not always manage to look into but to which a solution should not be delayed.

One of the most important issues mentioned by virtually everyone was that of restructuring Prosecutor's Office work connected with general supervision. In Prosecutor's Office terms, general supervision means supervising compliance with the law by state organs, kolkhozes, cooperative and other organizations, and officials and citizens. Embezzlement, poor working conditions, breaches of labor safety procedures, pollution of the environment, shoddy workmanship in production, overreporting, and much more—the Prosecutor's Office must be one of the first to be informed of all this so that the necessary measures can be taken. What methods should be used to check a vast enterprise, where should the necessary economic information be obtained, and what should be done if a prosecutor finds himself powerless before a powerful ministry which pays no attention to instructions issued by a Prosecutor's Office? Many prosecutors have tried to find answers to these questions. Many are still unanswered. But the most important point is that these questions have been raised—it is no longer possible to cover them up without offering a comprehensive solution.

On the one hand, the Prosecutor's Office needs to expand its staff—it needs economists with knowledge in a number of fields and ecologists—but on the other, it is sometimes the case that the Prosecutor's Office becomes an organization duplicating the work of executive committees, health and disease units, the Department for Combating Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation, and various other inspectorates. The Prosecutor's Office does not have the right to neglect anything these verification organs have not had time to check but it also checks what has been checked already.

With the transition to economic accountability, enterprises themselves now have an interest in revealing transgressions. This is affecting the work of the Prosecutor's Office. It means that new forms of working with "industrialists" have to be found and supervisory methods changed, as the economy cannot be pulled up by sanctions alone. This is a subject for future discussions.

The conference could not bypass the problem of unlawful arrest, which is a subject painful to everyone. People recalled the lessons of the "Vitebsk cases," in which innocent people were wrongly sentenced. A. Antoshin, prosecutor for Moscow's Cheremushkinskiy Rayon, noted that in addition to "residual signs of a bias toward prosecution" a new problem is taking shape in Prosecutor's Office work—a fear of penalizing people for unlawful practices. One check has shown that in a considerable number of cases the decision has been taken to terminate them on grounds of rehabilitation. A more thorough analysis has shown that in the majority of cases it was simply a case of insufficient evidence being obtained for charges to be brought.

This lack of moderation at both ends of the scale not only prevents the triumph of the rule of law but also undermines the authority of the Prosecutor's Office.

How is this authority to be enhanced and strengthened? How can we insure against unlawful arrests, despite the fact that sometimes there is absolutely no doubt that the suspect is guilty? How can we guarantee people detained in custody their civil rights? This was the subject of a large part of the report by S. Vinokurov, prosecutor for Kiev's Minskiy Rayon. The work experience of this Prosecutor's Office was approved at the conference.

During the conference interval I asked General Prosecutor A.M. Rekunkov about his impressions of what had been said. Aleksandr Mikhaylovich said that it is still too early to talk about restructuring in Prosecutor's Office organs as if it were a fait accompli. Restructuring is only just beginning to gather momentum and bear the first fruits. "No one, as you can see, is embarrassed or afraid to talk about shortcomings in the Prosecutor's Office. What do I personally find particularly displeasing? First of all our bureaucratic, awkward style, examples of which have been heard at this conference. A prosecutor must be humane and wise. And this should be apparent even in such seemingly trivial aspects as his speech."

A great deal more has been said at this conference. People have argued with Rekunkov and his colleagues. I cannot cover everything here—many issues are too specific and would be better commented on by legal experts than a journalist.

So what went unmentioned? The "telephone law" which is still very often used—that is, pressure on a prosecutor by local party authorities. This was not mentioned on the rostrum but people discussed it in the interval, among themselves. Why? Were they afraid? Hardly. One prosecutor said that representatives of local authorities are beginning to make less frequent use of this "telephone law" and are on their guard. This means that restructuring is beginning to take effect.

Legal Expert on 'Presumption of Innocence'

PM0605141188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Academician V. Kudryavtsev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute: "Democratization and Legality. Believing People"]

[Text] Moscow—All the initiatives and actions making up restructuring, the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum stressed, ultimately have one thing in common—addressing people and their needs and interests. The democratization of social life and the humanization of relations between people should lead to substantive changes in the economic and political systems and increase the importance of moral and legal values and the great gains of human culture.

Such gains include many legal ideas and principles worked out over millennia and reflecting general human experience. Their importance is as fundamental as the principles of mechanics or genetic formulas. If we build a house without taking account of the laws of physics, it will crumble. If we administer justice while ignoring the principles of law, the just and the guilty alike will perish and public morality will disintegrate. One such fundamental legal principle is the presumption of innocence. "A person is innocent until proven guilty" is the most general formulation of this presumption, reinforced by international pacts on human rights, our Constitution (Article 160), procedural law, and judgments.

Attitudes toward the presumption of innocence define the fundamental dividing line between democracy and reaction, legality and tyranny, real and fictitious justice. Indeed: Guided by the presumption of innocence, we proceed on the basis that all people are honest until objectively and irrefutably proven not to be. Prosecutors are obliged to prove the guilt of the accused, rather than the accused having to prove their innocence. The accused shall have the benefit of any doubts. People can only be found guilty of a crime by a court.

These and other democratic provisions are difficult gains in the struggle against tyranny and illegality. It is not hard to see that the starting point here is faith in people and their integrity. This is the cornerstone of social justice, humanism, democratic traditions, and convictions.

Suspicions, intolerance, mistrust of people, and lack of respect for individuals are the basis of the opposing position, which in the sphere of the law is reflected in an accusatory bias. After all, if people are in principle dishonest and capable of becoming criminals, they only have to be caught. This argument is simple: If there is no proof of guilt, let's get some false witnesses together and force people to "confess." It is this position that is reflected in the illegality of the personality cult period—illegality that, of course, had nothing whatsoever to do with justice. It was this that formed the basis of the Vyshinskiy concept, which claimed that in cases of crimes against the state the "explanations of the accused inevitably acquire the nature and importance of fundamental evidence."

For many years the presumption of innocence was interpreted as a bourgeois invention. The ignorance underlying this approach is obvious if only because the basic ideas of the presumption of innocence were formulated by Roman lawyers, reinforced in the Code of Justinian (6th century), and reflected in the Russkaya Pravda [medieval Russian legal code] (11th-13th centuries). The presumption of innocence can be said to be an idea, hard-won over the centuries, of personal freedom and the rectitude and respectability of the individual.

Restructuring, the democratization process, glasnost, and the strengthening of legality in our country are consistently and steadily restoring faith in people and their worth and honor. This has been seen not only in the USSR Supreme Court's rehabilitation of those who were wrongly convicted, where the presumption of innocence worked to the full. I think that the ban on anonymous letters—essentially accusations for whose authenticity nobody is responsible—was an expression of the same democratic line. The humanization of social relations and the restoration of confidence in people also fully apply to other social problems such as, for instance, the problem of former prisoners of war and missing persons. Does the presumption of innocence really not extend to them? Finally, the very principle "Everything not prohibited is permitted," which is still being imlemented only slowly, is a very full expression of new—or, more accurately, normal—relations between people in socialist society.

The priority of faith in people and respect for them in the face of suspicion and intolerance of different views and actions would seem to be obvious. But life shows that the restructuring of social and individual awareness has still by no means been completed. Old stereotypes also live on among lawyers. The State and Law Institute recently polled a large group of legal specialists—scientists and practitioners. I will cite just two figures. The question of how the court should act if the evidence to back up a charge is insufficient and cannot be supplemented was correctly answered—the accused should be acquitted—by just 44 percent of those polled (56 percent among scientists and lecturers).

The second question of how you react to the well-known formula "Better to let 10 guilty men go free than to convict a single innocent man" met with agreement among 58 percent of those polled. The rest were uncertain. And that among lawyers who, it seems to me, simply have no right to work if they do not share the basic principles of humanism and legality.

The accusatory bias—the onerous legacy of the administrative edict system—is still doggedly cherished in legal practice. Here is the relatively simple case of Engineer L. In 1985-1986 the Moscow Oblast people's courts three times found him guilty of a crime he did not commit (a road accident that resulted in loss of life). Why three times? Because each time the prosecutor objected—not to the wrong and illegal conviction but to the...lightness of the sentence imposed by the court. Justice prevailed in the fourth court—the Moscow Oblast Court—which finally decided at the end of last year that the charge against L. was "not based on the factual circumstances of the case in hand," and found that there was no case to answer.

Needless to say, the fight against crime must be active, uncompromising, and skillful. But it should not [illegible] false accusations! The recently adopted CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Status of the Fight Against Crime in the Country and Additional Measures To Prevent Lawbreaking" stresses again and again that all workers at law-enforcement organs are obliged to set an example of the strictest observance of Soviet laws, of attention to and respect for people, and of high responsibility.

The incomplete nature of the restructuring of public (and, unfortunately, professional) awareness explains why we have still not eschewed overcautious court decisions, the fear of admitting defense attorneys at earlier stages of criminal trials, excessive faith in admissions of guilt by the accused....

Let us dwell on the last point. In recent years the USSR Supreme Court Plenum has repeatedly explained that confessions by the accused can form the basis of a conviction only if backed up by an objective body of evidence. This is also required by the law of procedure (Article 77, RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure). Of course, it should not be said that in our courts a confession by the accused is regarded as making them the "star witness." But, regrettably, its importance continues to be overvalued.

Why, one would think, should we not believe people who admit their own guilt! But on closer inspection this judgment turns out to be a mistake in many cases.

B. was found dead in the Moscow area the year before last. Her husband, who confessed at the preliminary investigation and in court, was the chief suspect. Despite this, the people's court still had its doubts, and it twice referred the case for further investigation. Once again the prosecutors took it to court, until the actual killer was finally found.... The case against B. was dropped and he was released.

Objective research shows that false confessions—self-incrimination—arise for many reasons. These include genuine confusion about the degree of one's guilt, attempts to save a relative or friend from their proper punishment, the desire to speed up the investigation so as later to retract the confession in court, and the idea that defense is pointless in the face of the severity of the accumulated "evidence" (this was the case for B.). There are many reasons for false confessions: The most dangerous of them is pressure on the accused—be it intimidation or the promise of various benefits. I am not talking about physical coercion, although that also happens.

Statistics show that approximately 3 percent of sentences based on miscarriage of justice involve, in one way or another, false confessions. Not too many? No judicial error is permissible, even if it concerns just a single individual.

How is the principle of presumption of innocence to be consolidated and made the immutable starting point in any criminal case? I believe there is no single measure capable of accomplishing this task. The forthcoming judicial and legal reform must consolidate the authority of judges and preclude their dependence on either local influences or the investigative apparatus. It is necessary to develop and establish a juridical and social mechanism to protect the rights and legitimate interests of all citizens, including those who find themselves "within the orbit" of the administration of justice. It is, of course, also necessary to enhance most energetically the political and legal culture of jurists.

It was said at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum: We must firmly pursue a line of consolidating the legal levers of restructuring, of consistent observance of legality. In this context, the setting up of universal legal education as a uniform comprehensive program covering all strata of the population would be greatly beneficial. I think that this universal education should not bypass professional jurists, either. We have not only to teach others; we ourselves must learn more, we must learn democracy, glasnost, and attentiveness to and respect for people.

Any underestimation of the fundamental principles of democracy and legality in the administration of justice costs the state and society dear: We are, after all, talking about the honor, dignity, property, and at times the very life of people. The nurturing of trust in man is a vivid characteristic of restructuring. In my view, it is closely linked with a broader problem—the consolidation of trust between peoples and states, between all people inhabiting our planet. All this is indeed a manifestation of the new thinking to which in our time there is no alternative.

'Dictatorship of Proletariat' Call Derided

PM0905135588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Vl. Zhigalko "Lampoon": "The Kind of Dictatorship We Need"—boldface as published]

[Text] The author solemnly swears that he would not have written this lampoon if he had not been terrified. When you are terrified, you sometimes feel like laughing. Because in individual cases when people frighten you, the situation becomes funny.

That is, the author realizes that it is possible to write only serious monographs on the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But if a respectable publication prints absurd things about the dictatorship of the proletariat, allow me to say so plainly. Even in a lampoon. The genre matches the scientific level of the arguments.

The essence of the article "What Kind of Restructuring Do We Need" carried in the Leningrad publication DIALOG boils down to several theses, which the author of this lampoon provides in a direct quote:

1. "It is known that after the 20th CPSU Congress the view became established in the party and society that all struggle had ended and that progress toward the targets outlined in the Third Party Program would now proceed without resistance, as it were, of its own accord" (p 11).

2. "This was expressed in the formal abandonment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and was a mistake..." (p 11).

3. "The abandonment of the dictatorship of the proletariat essentially meant the abandonment of the conscious and systematic struggle against petit bourgeois attitudes" (p 12).

4. "Socialism in our country was a social organism surrounded on all sides by social parasites sucking the juices from the working people and trying to implant their standards not only in the economy but also in all other spheres of our life. It is they, the millionaire parasites and their spongers, who need to raise prices and create what are essentially capitalist enterprises in the guise of cooperatives, when several members of a cooperative share among themselves the income obtained with the help of hundreds hired under contract. It is they who need the dominance of American mass culture designed to dupe the working people while making the 'stars' rich and to squeeze out the classics and folk, national culture" (p 14).

5. "...If we once again raise the banner of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which gives real socialist democracy and enables us not to cover up the contrast in views but to separate socialism's real supporters from its actual opponents, then we will advance against petit bourgeois attitudes, albeit slowly and cautiously, and not yield to them one position after another, as frequently happens now.

"So all conscious members of socialist society must put an end to complacency and placidity and to ideas of spontaneous progress, without struggle, and dispose themselves to a persistent and conscious struggle to develop the socialist element in socialism and to overcome petit bourgeois attitudes, which also have their carriers, expressers, and champions in all spheres. And it is such restructuring that we need" (p 15).

Here the author would like to have a serious talk with members of the esteemed publication's editorial board. First, sort out which congress it was that adopted the Third Party Program. A detail, of course, but it attests to the extent of the article's scientific soundness. Second, there cannot be a "formal abandonment" of class dictatorship. This, excuse me, was known by the inquisitive members of Petersburg workers' circles back at the beginning of the century. They did, indeed, make a serious study of Marxism. Likewise, you can't find abandoned on Nevskiy Prospect "...the banner of the dictatorship of the proletariat" discarded by some political malefactors and "raise it aloft" in the socialist state of the whole people.

Let us ask ourselves a question which has already been professionally interpreted by the aforementioned members of Petersburg workers' circles. Dictatorship of which class over which class? And for what purpose? If you proceed from the text of the article in the esteemed DIALOG, we need a dictatorship against these very pernicious **socialist** cooperative members.

Cool down, comrades; calm down, colleagues! Take a look at statistical data. There are, in all, 200,000 socialist cooperative members. And they are harried [zatryukhannyy] and browbeaten by our beloved bureaucrats and neighborhood public opinion. So, will we bring the whole weight of dictatorship to bear upon them? Will we introduce extraordinary commissions [chrezvychayka], road blocks, and three- or seven-man commissions [troyka, semerka]? This has happened before. They did away with producer cooperatives over immense areas and abolished private farmsteads, and to this day we are still quite unable to produce sufficient "socialistically pure meat" and adequate quantities of "orthodox" shoe heels.

Here the author must sincerely confess that he admits the appearance of both resourceful brokers and thieving speculators in the cooperative family. But what has this to do with dictatorship of the proletariat? What is needed, all in all, is a fair income tax and an incorruptible, well paid financial inspector. Then swindlers will languish in jail, while honest cooperative members work enterprisingly, satisfying all the expanding requirements of the esteemed editorial board and the author of this lampoon.

The weekly asserts that hundreds of thousands of underground millionaires are growing fat in the country (p 14). Since it says hundreds of thousands, there must be at least 200,000. Let us multiply 1 million (if they have just R1 million each) by 200,000, and we will get 200 billion. Where does the editorial board get such data? From which sources? But the meaning is as clear as daylight. Seek a millionaire in your own neighborhood, citizen. Keep watch. Abandon your work, comrade, and seek him out. For, as you see, there are at least two unexposed millionaires hiding on the territory administered by every housing operation office. The chief feature of such articles is a minimum of proof and a maximum of slogans and conclusions.

In the ancient Russian city of Vladimir the author of this lampoon familiarized himself meticulously with the work of the "Elektron" cooperative, which repairs both Soviet and foreign television and radio equipment which has turned out to be of rather poor quality, as well as carrying out other orders equally dear to the hearts of citizens exhausted in the snares of consumer services. And the author swears that he did not discover among the Vladimir cooperative members: a) underground millionaires; b) villains duping the masses with Western mass culture; c) troglodytes demanding increased prices. The author even established that individual members of the "Elektron" cooperative go to chamber choir concerts of Russian songs, as well as singing and dancing personally in actual folklore ensembles.

Yet the author of this lampoon will venture to maintain that he considers dictatorship necessary. But which kind? Dictatorship of common sense. Dictatorship of the requirements of real life over cast-iron copybook maxims. Dictatorship of reason over ignorance, dictatorship of good and honesty over sullen everyday envy.

Restructuring is hard, very hard work. But it is work which straightens the backs of the weak, energizes the strong, and opens up horizons for creators.

Therefore there is no need to panic. There is a particularly well-kept military secret that panic is not the best form of battle. And, as the author has been informed by serious military people, not a single battle has been won with the help of panic. On the other hand, there is no need to jump out of your own pants in order to run ahead of progress. In general, progress is not made at a run.

Our restructuring is still very, very young. But already you cannot break it or trample it underfoot, and it will live and grow. Because it is ours, and we have achieved it through suffering.

As for dictatorship, it exists and is living and struggling. The dictatorship of Leninist thought and Leninist revolutionary action.

Past Secrecy Over 'Afghan Drama' Criticized

PM1005110988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Albert Plutnik article: "If Only It Had Not Been for the War.... The People Always Yearn for Peace and Quiet"]

[Text] An old acquaintance of mine came to Moscow just before Victory Day from a province that is not all that far away. According to custom, we talked a lot—about what had happened and about what is happening. He, a plant engineer, certainly likes much of what is happening now—people show more openness, more interest in affairs. While having so far experienced only to a lesser degree the other real fruits of change, he is nonetheless convinced that they will materialize, that we are on the right path. If truth be said, he became somewhat depressed when the conversation turned to the food situation in the small town where he lives; in other words about actual fruit, vegetables, meat, and milk. Supplies, he said, were bad. But straight away, as if having decided that it is wrong for men to complain, he caught himself in mid-sentence: "Never mind, everything will work out. If only it had not been for the war...."

Why do I recall this today, on such a day?

Victory Day is not just a holiday for the people. It is a holiday created by the people. It does not figure in either the lunar or the solar calendar. It was forged, smelted, and gained through suffering by soldiers and commanders in a war without equal, through the sweat on the brows of working people at the front and in the rear. In terms of volume and complexity, the work which they performed was on a scale unknown to any other people throughout human history, it was endlessly prolonged and mortally dangerous work. The people did not spare themselves in those years, firmly aware of how significant their objective was, of how important it was to traverse the path charted for them until its victorious end.

"If only it had not been for the war." How many times has each one of us heard or uttered these words when talking about mistakes of the past and the present, about serious omissions by the authorities which have affected the people's fate and the daily life of millions of people. How many times are they repeated by people with supreme tolerance, with supreme modesty if you like, as if thus absolving all the sins committed by those who are to blame for the fact that we are still living worse than might otherwise be possible and proper. A trite expression, but it does reflect the people's awareness, in which war is always a symbol of everything that is most hated, unnatural, and abhorrent to mind and soul.

The bloody dawn of war has burst upon Russia so often that its people seem to know best of all the meaning of war. And they appreciate life without war, no matter how imperfect it may be, as the supreme benefit available to man. We are prepared to forgive a lot, we are prepared to overlook a lot. Difficulties with housing? Meat shortages? If only it had not been for the war. No, war is not needed by a country whose land has already sprouted whole forests of concrete obelisks from previous wars.

If only it had not been for the war, despite the fact that Russian arms have won eternal glory and that the Red Army, the Soviet Army, gained many unfading victories. History lists examples when military triumphs awakened in vainglorious rulers the yearning for new conquests, pushed ambitious people to new victories, and sounded like a trumpet call for more new wars. Since fate has victories in store, gain these victories.... That was typical of rulers but not of the people. There are no people who would have heard the call to war. Our people offer the best example. While gaining victory they did not yearn for more victories, they yearned for peace and quiet. The blood that was shed—even the enemy's blood—did not make them bloodthirsty; it only exacerbated their thirst for peace.

Victory Day encourages a conversation on war and peace. Especially since, for the 9th year running, we are celebrating this holiday while the country is taking part in another war which, until quite recently, was silent and almost inaudible across our vast land, a war which has struck not the whole world but one of its tiny corners. But even there, in that theater of combat operations, it has been and still is doing its job. Shots are still being fired there, bombs are exploding, wounded are groaning, and the dead are silent for ever. Our own people, our own children are among them. Now we know: The end of this war is also in sight. The soldiers will soon return home, leaving the foreign mountains and valleys behind. Those who have been luckier than their comrades will return.

Once the war is over we will certainly learn much more about it than we know now. The only thing we know today is that it is one of the grim legacies of the recent past, inherited from those who are no longer in charge of the fatherland's affairs. And since there is continuity of power, and other people's mistakes are at times more difficult to correct than one's own, this has already taken 3 years. But let me repeat: At long last the end of this war, which has already lasted twice as long as the Great Patriotic War, is in sight.

On the eve of Victory Day, the distant Afghan war suddenly came close to our editorial offices and singed them with its scorching breath. And in the peaceful Moscow of the eighties we experienced the bitter sense of personal frontline loss, a sense which had become numb with the passage of time since 9 May 1945. It was over the freshly dug grave of our comrade Sasha Sekretarev that we sensed, with a suddenly renewed pain, what the victory over fascism, the victory over the war which had engulfed the globe, had meant for the country and for the whole world.

Is there anyone who could—in the face of real people, people who were alive and healthy until only yesterday, quite young people slain or maimed on the battlefield; in the face of young widows and infant orphans; in the face of martyrs and sufferers—dare say that, as far as history is concerned, the cost of any particular victory is not all that important? (Just think: Widows from the last war are still waiting for the individual apartments and other benefits which are their due, and a new wave of widows is already lengthening this sorrowful line.) Would anyone dare face the victims and assert that history justifies everything? Could it possibly justify the "farsighted strategy" of Marshal Brezhnev, chairman of the Defense Council at the time?

Today, living in the atmosphere of glasnost which is becoming established, the supersecrecy which has surrounded the Afghan drama from its very beginning causes particular protest and indignation within us. (Look no further than the bureaucratic expression "limited contingent," coined in the official militarese fashion.) Could this be why it has produced many more wounded than actual wounds. People in their thousands, including those long past conscription age, have been hurt by the fact that much is being concealed from them. Virtually everything is being concealed. The war itself seems to have been a military secret. For a long time there was no mention of it at all in speeches from lofty rostrums or in the open press. Later on, scanty news reports started seeping through—mainly stories about heroism, essentially postscripts to the award of titles and high decorations. We realized that things were difficult there. Otherwise why award military distinctions? Yesterday's kids, having matured and spent several weeks and months there, in a foreign country, finally started appearing in newspaper photographs and on television screens. But one could still sense that even they left a lot unsaid. As if everything in Afghanistan was happening for the sole purpose of giving soldiers from the latest drafts an opportunity to prove that they too could perform feats.

A country whose sons did not always come back from the battlefields could not even openly honor their memory—it knew nothing about their deaths. There was scanty news about military operations and a total silence about military losses. What was the sense of this lack of glasnost? Who needed it and why? To break through this lack of glasnost and to put an end to the war required as much courage as fighting there.

Soon enough we will be able to mention this—the end of the war in Afghanistan—as part of the answer to the currently popular question: "What has restructuring actually given us already?", among other answers in favor such as the sharp change of the social atmosphere, the considerable democratization of life, the revival of social self-awareness after a long break, the dismissal of dogmatists from top positions [ot pervykh roley], and the promotion of thinking people who are not blinkered by schematism and dogmatism. This is a powerful argument. Surely, all that is happening there, far away from our homes, does the daily life affect all the Soviet people, each and every one of us? Yes, we are still experiencing shortages of good quality commodities in stores, there are still quite a few lines. The retuning of the economic mechanism is under way, but the results do not appear as swiftly as we all would like. But the result of peace will emerge immediately. It is much more than just the material aspect, even though this aspect is important since there are no cheap wars. The paramount result of the peace that will be achieved will comprise the saved lives and the saved prestige of the country.

It is perhaps still difficult for us to fully assess, face to face, the event which is to occur shortly. It demanded wisdom, political wisdom inseparable from lofty courage. The point is that, no matter how difficult it might be to imagine, this action is capable of bringing forth disagreement by those who are not accustomed to combining politics and morality while acting in the spirit of the new thinking.

But the main point is that the step has been taken.

If only it had not been for the war. The people are prepared to put up with a lot and to forgive a lot. This is a sign of both staunchness and modesty. A lot is being forgiven. Behind this understanding attitude lies the tolerance inculcated down through the centuries which, say what you will, is more bad than good. Modesty is transformed from a virtue into an evil, into lack of demandingness and indulgence which knows no bounds.

Fortunately, we are changing. Democratization and glasnost are slowly releasing many people from their blind submission to fate, from their customary modesty leaning toward acceptance of shortcomings and omissions in social life and social production. We are already more demanding—toward life, toward society, toward our own selves.

Yes, we are becoming different. But not in everything, fortunately. Having mastered a long time ago the science of gaining victory at the battlefield, mastering the lessons of democracy today, having openly and firmly declared their unwillingness to put up any longer with sluggishness and bureaucratism, with everything that stops them from properly revealing their tremendous potential and forces them to "be satisfied with less"—with a living standard that is not high—our people still place the highest value not on even the most brilliant victories but on peace on earth.

This is what our people are like, this is what they will remain like.

Paper Defends Ukrainian Kolkhoz Chairman

PM0505140288 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 3 May 88 p 5

[Yuriy Chernichenko article: "Scenario for Part Four: The Movie 'An Impersonal Case'"]

[Text] The director of "An Impersonal Case" ["Nepersonalnoye Delo"] is 30, and this is his first work of his own at the Central Studio of Documentary Movies. The movie played triumphantly only in Moscow's creative institutes. It was announced in the television schedules and publicized in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, but taken off the air. SOVETSKAYA KULTURA published a letter to the editorial office about the fate of the movie. IZVESTIYA (issues 100 and 107) is conducting a methodical siege on the braking forces. And Algis Arlauskas himself, in the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, explained:

"I wanted to show the movie where it was shot. I took the film with me. The whole village assembled to watch the movie and discuss it. But the director of the local network received instructions from the oblast movie network in no circumstances to show it. I spent the whole day with the party raykom secretary.... Now the Central Studio of Documentary Movies is fighting for a screening and discussion of the movie at the kolkhoz after all, with the participation of all interested parties.... And to film the discussion... With glasnost, in the spirit of the times."

Yes, it was a tough beginning, but an enviable one. Growing up quickly: a first movie, and into battle. V. Novikov, director of the Central Studio of Documentary Movies, said in print, in IZVESTIYA, that they might be adding another part, a fourth, to the picture.

History likes to give proper names to particular periods—for identification. "Ramzin"—and there you have the start of the great breakthrough. "Khudenko" and "Snimshchikov"—there you have the atmosphere of the Brezhnev 5-year plans. "Sivkov, the Arkhangelsk peasant"—need I say more, need I spell it out? It is by no means impossible that the Ukrainian peasant surname of the hero of "An Impersonal Case" will join these ranks. His opponents cannot be accused of being soft or of edifying condescension: Viktor Prokopovich Belokon has survived because he himself fights like a Brest soldier. An amputee from the Great Patriotic War, Hero of Socialist Labor, and for 28 years head of a model kolkhoz in the Ukraine, by all calculations he should have died 5 or 6 years ago in the strict-regime colonies. But thanks to his peasant nature, strong physique, and also the in-depth civil defense which operated, it cannot be denied, at all times, during all kinds of "stagnation" and "precrisis" periods, Belokon is alive, strong, and fighting from the screen! The fact that he did not die of high blood pressure, shame, and "nerves" back in 1982 is the "fault" of Anatoliy Karpov. Yes, him, the chess player. And Georgiy Arbatov—yes, again, the Arbatov, the academician and political scientist. And Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov—again, the Andropov, not someone else of the same name. After a moving request from Deputy Arbatov, Yu.V. Andropov instructed the USSR Prosecutor's Office to look into Belokon's case—and the verdict (5 years in a corrective labor colony!) was challenged and revised, and replaced (to save the face of Justice) by a suspended sentence. "The court committed an error in the legal evaluation of the act," as the headed notepaper smoothly informed the kolkhoz. Of the 194 Communists on the kolkhoz, 193 voted against his explusion from the party (the party organization secretary receives his wages from the raykom, and correspondingly voted "for"). The oxygen of cooperation and support has always surrounded the Belokon family in Serby. For 5 years, for sure, Viktor Prokopovich headed the civil defense staff—no kidding, even if you do pass that off as a metaphor.

The defense forces show how cruel the onslaught was. The banning of the movie was no mistake: It was to safeguard their own interests! Since the picture was taken off the air by Central Television on 22 March, Belokon has once again come under fire from officials on administrative organs, visitors from the organizational departments—from the rayon, Odessa, and Kiev—have begun to visit the rayon, and dozens of people, including the rural medical practitioner, have been indoctrinated personally: How dare you support a convicted man? A major event of the "3 weeks of Nina Andreyeva." All kinds of pressure are brought to bear on former investigator for major cases V.S. Sando, who admitted in the movie that "there was no evidence that a crime had been committed" and the trial in the village of Serby was fabricated by those invested with power. And yet not even the organizers from the organizational departments have seen the movie! If they let the movie be screened today in the movie theaters and on "Orbita," tomorrow they will have to send an investigator for major cases to Odessa....

It looks like a commonplace case of a chairman who buys construction materials "under the counter —and finds himself in court. Belokon did indeed buy 200 tonnes of roofing tin from a supplier near Moscow, part of it at the state price and part at a price over the odds, with the kolkhoz members' money and for the kolkhoz members' roofs. Then there is the R64,000 "cut" received by a broker who was sentenced to 14 years' imprisonment.

But in that case, why does N.I. Makogon, former first secretary of Kodymskiy party raykom, who organized the reprisals, avoid the movie cameras? Why does V. Shets, the Odessa Obkom worker who wanted to expel the chairman from the party, hide from the movie journalists, citing the "right of every Soviet person not to be photographed"(!)? If the retribution was just, why be afraid of publicity? The problem is that the war invalid, tired of persecution by the courts and of knocking on every conceivable door, is not asking for mercy or leniency—he is tearing off the masks and demanding recompense. He is—just think of it!—appealing to the nation.

"Do you think that because the movie camera comes between us, this is not your concern?" he says straight to the viewer in the final sequence. "It is. To a greater or lesser extent, but it is your concern all the same. Even when I am no longer in this world and my bones have decayed, it is still your concern! If they can do this to me, and after all I am a Hero of Socialist Labor and a man who has won many orders and medals, if they can crush me, as you might say, ruin my life... If such lawlessness goes on happening in our country... If all these Makogons and people of that kind go on working wonders in our country, nobody can be confident of his future. It seems to me that the time has come to stop this. Something must be done. We cannot go on living like this."

What is to be done? First, to take seriously, from a legal viewpoint, Belokon's statement in the movie that raykom First Secretary Makogon demanded R3,500 from him. And made him take that sum from the kolkhoz coffers. And when the chairman asked him to return the debt, when the Hero of Socialist Labor spoke out against the endless drinking sessions, against the systematic presentations to oblast officials at the expense of the kolkhoz, against that whole "good life" enjoyed by Makogon and his crew, who have lost all shame, then the machinery of the court was set in motion. In the name of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, they "ruined the life" of the man whose grain threshings and income enabled Makogon to become a delegate to the 26th party congress. Because he did become a delegate, that cannot be erased!

It is incumbent on me too to give evidence—whether or not it is used to supplement the movie. To keep quiet and conceal what I learned in 6 years of involvement in the Belokon case would be to help those who are avoiding the camera. The camera, and the prison cell.

In the spring of 1982 Anatoliy Karpov, who knows the kolkhoz in Serby village through the chess club there, said to me: "Save a certain Ukrainian farmer, he is a courageous and honest man...." I was the only writer to be present at the Ukrainian Supreme Court when the Odessa verdict was rubber-stamped and confirmed there, by which time only his title of Hero was keeping Belokon out of prison. I know how firmly and uncompromisingly Rovno chairman V.A. Plyutinskiy, member of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, stood out for Belokon to keep his Gold Star—really a guiding star at that time. I have already mentioned the actions of Academician Arbatov, I will only emphasize: All meetings were set aside, all the affairs of the Institute of the United States were postponed until Viktor Prokopovich's life was out of danger.

Makogon did not hide from me. On the contrary: At our first meeting he took me into the forest. To a hidden glade—to drink vodka! He looks like an alcoholic and suffers from liver disease. His young driver complained to the boss that the stalls are no longer giving him anything good, and placed a bottle of vodka made from wood alcohol in front of the boss. Why these dubious meetings? There was no other way to find out two things. Did he, the raykom first secretary, take that large sum from the coffers of the Serby kolkhoz? Is it the tin for which Belokon was sentenced that covers the rayon House of Culture and the big-screen movie theater, the biggest buildings in the district? For me personally, the guilt or innocence of the former leading light depended on the answers.

"Yes, I took money from the kolkhoz to buy a 'Volga' car, but I gave it back later. They reminded me, and I handed it over!"

As if he was talking about a bus ticket. How many zeros would there have to be, before Nikolay Ivanovich would regard it as a serious sum?

"Yes, it is the same material, but at the time we had not discovered whose it was and where it came from...."

The rayispolkom applied formally for deliveries of tin to the kolkhoz: The rayispolkom chairman sent the letter. And, as if afraid of being too late, the militia sent its couriers—not the rayon militia, the oblast militia! According to invoice No 1334 on 3 June 1981 the Serby village kolkhoz sold the Ukrremstroytrest repair and construction administration of the Ukrainian SSR MVD galvanized iron for R1,350—no secret about that!

So what does it amount to? Rayon and oblast officials, eagerly warming their own hands, watched for years how Belokon received freightcar after freightcar of scarce tin from warehouses in the Moscow area, and when their own need for roofing materials was satisfied, sprang the trap? And convicted the man who—as the entire course of the investigation confirmed!—never took a penny for himself? Who roofed the houses of 200 kolkhoz families, so that the kolkhoz would continue to have sufficient manpower and Serby would continue to work without ever having to bring in "patronage" workers? Who drew up a register of the kolkhoz members who paid for it, so that everything was plainly proved and the innocence of the affair was clear? And sent him "to a strict-regime colony," "with confiscation of property"? So what can you call a provocation, what can you call the use of official position for selfish purposes? What about those who embezzled R64,000?

"The broker Bachurin took that money," I.K. Sokolenko, chairman of the oblast court in Odessa, assured me guilelessly. "It was said that he spent the money on himself. For which he was convicted."

So they gave Bachurin what he was short of, for the sake of his pretty face.... If the court had the state's interests in view, rather than the aims of the Makogons, how come they did not investigate where the other end of the thread led to? That task was child's play: All the bank accounts through which the kolkhoz paid for what it acquired still exist, the addresses are available. The Moscow Oblast Main Administration for construction is still there—and if its bosses suddenly decided to do a great favor, for nothing, to people 1,000 versts away in the south, these generous motives are also accessible to investigation by the Department for Combating Embezzlements of Socialist Property and Speculation.

But no: The thread has only one end! As does the story of the R130,000 "cut" for mixed feed that Belokon tells in the movie. It is noteworthy that neither the republic

Supreme Court nor the USSR Prosecutor's Office, when reviewing the Odessa court blunder, asked the elementary question: Whose tin was it, anyway, that was sold near Odessa by that broker Bachurin, who—according to the rules of the profession—took all the blame on himself?

When I, a novice in investigation, began to trace the threads in the supply labyrinths of Moscow Oblast, people hinted to me: Don't meddle. To take good roofing from a kolkhoz you need official status, but to find out who was robbed, you also need official status.

Fine, but why should I keep quiet? They roared at him—but did he shut up? No way. A satire—a form that is accessible to me—entitled "Justice With a Weighing Machine" was typeset for KROKODIL, Belokon read the proofs and checked it for inaccuracies—red light! No sooner had my sketch "The Combine Mows and Threshes..." come out, and a high-ranking official declared that I was living up to my surname and "blackening" people [the name Chernichenko resembles "chernit," to blacken]. More ostracism... With a group from Central Television, I filmed Belokon and the process of destruction of a leading kolkhoz.... And the television feature "Why Beacons Are Extinguished" prompted an instantaneous reaction: A convicted man—on the small screen?! The (former) leadership of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting decided to punish...the editor, who did not go anywhere. And the director, who did not know where I was taking him. First dismissal, then party reprimands. But the author alone is to blame, what position did they put him in, pray? Oh no, they did not even reprimand me. The case is such that a punishment could turn into an award at any moment.... I am therefore very glad that the journalist Boris Gurnov took up this purely agrarian topic and worked on it with passion. The resulting picture, even without any supplements, was such that a packed auditorium at the Moscow House of Cinema gave a standing ovation to the authors and the movie's hero, Viktor Prokopovich, who was present at the premiere.

As for me, the Belokon case showed me why ships sink. The captain is destroyed—the ship, with the same crew and apparently following the same course, suddenly, before your very eyes, keels over and sinks into the water faster than the "Admiral Nakhimov." Belokon made a good farm! You can swab down the livestock units for when someone comes to visit, but one "money-making yard"—a subsidiary shop—can keep the whole of the profitability "afloat." In more than 30 years I have seen at least 1,000 kolkhozes, and formed my own opinions....

Under Belokon, all the old ravines were planted with young walnuts! He himself—at his age—could not expect to see the crop, the trees are destined for the 21st century. Some 53 km of asphalt roads were laid on the kolkhoz—as much as in the whole of the Kulundinskaya Steppe where I spent my Virgin Land days. A splendid orchard with seasonally chosen varieties and a vast cold store (2,000 tonnes of storage space!) operated for the benefit of the Urals in winter: The apples went to the children of Sverdlovsk and Nizhniy Tagil. No, it was a farm for the future, not for showing off to officials.

"One-sided! Both the articles and the movie. Is Belokon an angel, then?" No. Angels—especially in our conditions—do not build anything. Still less do they erect dozens of facilities. Nothing is left behind after an angel. Or, incidentally, after a Makogon.

The "Znamya Lenina" Kolkhoz in the village of Serby now produces hog meat and sugar beet at a loss—in the Ukraine! The farm's profitability in 1987 was...4.1 percent. Income? Net income R303,000, of which 92,000 was from the Main Administration for State Insurance, for disasters and damage. But 12 times that sum was paid out to the workers: 2.4 million (the insurance does not count). Out of the gross income, more than 80 percent goes on wages—a sellout, a self-consuming economy. But also, a fund of good will toward the leadership!

The new chairman has not won economic fame, and his name need not be taken in vain. But a shadow has already fallen on the post. According to A. Golub, head of the rayon agro-industrial association, the Serby Kolkhoz is, in terms of the grain yield (taking into account the results of the land survey) ranks 14th in the rayon. There are only 16. How come the last but two was made a member of the raykom bureau, what can he teach them—how to sell out? How come he was the one who went to the kolkhoz congress in Moscow?

It is just that bureaucracy finds it far more convenient to have losses of millions of rubles and empty food stores in Odessa, than to have independence on the part of the Belokons and their point-blank calls—"give back the kolkhoz' money!" The result of the movie that was not shown was, in effect, a "second" expulsion from the party for Belokon. After long sittings, a meeting in Serby revoked its decision to admit the former "chief" as a candidate member of the CPSU. Don't get filmed, don't pick a fight—"resign yourself to it, proud man."

Makogon was removed some years ago from the post of first secretary—he is now on the rayon agro-industrial association. The authors of "An Impersonal Case" failed to entice him to give them an interview there. Perhaps someone else will manage to talk to him in the right way.

...Having seen this lean, daring director who is overwhelmed by what happened, I told him that he, simpleton as he is, has ruined the case and harmed Belokon and the village: Whatever made him want to show the picture in some godforsaken Serby 2 or 3 days before it was on the air nationwide! Glasnost we wanted, now look at us!

To myself, however, I recalled the telegram from an old colleague to General Brusilov after his breakthrough: "Congratulations. Blessings. Embraces. I'm proud of you."

Briefs

Book on Youth Issues

The Molodaya Gvardiya publishing house has produced a book entitled Response [Otklik] which strives to answer young peoples' questions on a wide range of issues such as prostitution, the law on youth, informal youth associations and their relationship with the Komsomol, attitudes in the Army not covered by the regulations, and family relations. Psychologists, sociologists, and journalists have collaborated on the book, initiated March 1987 at a meeting of the publishing house in Moscow's Hall of Columns, where young people were asked to answer and submit questions. the book is published over a 3-month period to maintain topicality. [Summary] *[LD302335 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 30 Apr 88]*

New Estonian Party Organ

The Secretariat of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee discussed international relations today and appointed a Republican Commission on International Affairs with Indrek Toome, secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, as its chairman. [Summary] *[LD300247 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1600 GMT 13 Apr 88]*

Economic

Politburo Approves Estonian Management Plan

PM0905122388 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 30 Apr 88 p 1, 3

[Estonskoye Telegrafnoye Agentstvo-attributed L. Sher report "Briefing at the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] A briefing devoted to the results of an examination at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo of the Estonian SSR national economic management general plan was held at the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers 29 April.

Addressing journalists, B. Saul, chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, emphasized that the CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved the proposals submitted by the republic on the principles of the restructuring of the Estonian SSR national economic management structure. These are the principles: transfer at republic level to single organs of management of sector complexes, for which purpose seven state committees are being set up—for industry, the fuel and energy complex, transport, consumer services, public education, culture, and protection of the environment and forestry; and a shift of the center of gravity in management work to production enterprises which will, in accordance with local conditions, be integrated with scientific establishments, design organizations, trade enterprises, and so forth. To satisfy local requirements, the gaps which form between major enterprises will be filled by small enterprises and cooperatives. The Politburo agreed that it is necessary to preserve the existing administrative division of the republic and emphasized the role of local soviets and their executive organs in the implementation of the three major programs—the food program, the housing program, and the consumer goods production program. The expansion of local soviet ispolkoms' autonomy, especially regarding the structure and remuneration of labor within the ispolkom apparatus, was approved. Relevant union organs have been instructed to place a number of enterprises under republic jurisdiction. Thus, the "Estoplast" and Tallinn jewelry plants which produce consumer goods will come under republic jurisdiction in the near future, and it is also planned to hand over the "Pykhyala" factory, the Reola gas station, and the Pyarnu machine plant.

B. Saul emphasized that this must be viewed as the first stage of the switch of enterprises from union to republic jurisdiction. This process will continue in the future and encompass machine building and instrument making enterprises.

The Politburo supported republic proposals for 30-percent cuts in the administrative and management apparatus of organs under union jurisdiction located in the Estonian SSR and 25-percent cuts in the republic administrative apparatus, including 50-percent cuts in the central ministry apparatus. These changes are to be undertaken before the end of the current year.

Like the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Politburo envisages that the process of elaborating the republic national economic management system will continue in light of the Law on the State Enterprise and the Law on Cooperatives which will be discussed at the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. As is known, working groups have been set up in accordance with the 11 April Estonian SSR Council of Ministers Presidium resolution which are to define the functions, structure, and staffing of the new management organs. They will also generalize proposals received from various organizations and citizens and submit the results of their work to the republic government by 20 May. This will be followed by a discussion in the Estonian Supreme Soviet standing commissions.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers emphasized that efforts to improve the functions and structure of the new management organs will continue, since new problems are constantly arising in the course of restructuring which must also be taken into account in the management sphere.

B. Saul said that the republic government is planning to submit a number of proposals to union organs on the deepening of economic accountability relations. Attention is now focused at the enterprise level. In the current year 80 percent of output will be produced by economically accountable industrial enterprises. Transport, agriculture, and a number of other sectors have completed the switch to economic accountability at the enterprise level. Preconditions for the switch to economic accountability relations at a higher level, including the republic level, are transfer to wholesale trade, which has already been initiated, and a wage reform. A new procedure is being introduced in the elaboration of the republic state budget which is currently making big demands on finance experts and scientists. To effect the switch to economic accountability relations at the republic level it is necessary to resolve a whole series of major, large-scale questions including the creation of a system of substantiated prices, the elimination of disproportions in the development of production forces and production relations, and so forth.

B. Saul answered journalists' questions.

Conference Urged To Revise State Enterprise Law

LD0905155788 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 16, 17 Apr 88 p 8

[Article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences Boris Kurashvili: "Quality of the Law"]

[Text] One law—on the State Enterprise—has already been instituted, while another—on Cooperatives in the USSR—is being discussed. These laws are inseparable because the economy, for all of its diversity, is indivisible. Thus experience we have gained since the first of these laws was instituted is especially important. We must take a principled and impartial look at the Law on State Enterprise, at its quality and real effectiveness.

IZVESTIYA recently reported a typical case. The ministry "submitted" the target figures and state order for the current year to Uralmash (Urals Engineering Works), one of the biggest industrial associations. The Council of the Work Collective assessed the ministry's figures as inflated and unrealistic, and, proceeding from the assumption that under the Law the Enterprise works out and approves its five-year and annual plans independently, refused to accept the total order. The Council excluded from its plan the manufacture of goods which consumers find unnecessary (though the State Planning Committee and the ministry find them "necessary" to balance the figures on paper).

For the Ministry of Heavy Engineering, Uralmash was one of 17 similar cases. But unlike the others, Uralmash stuck to its guns. Possibly, IZVESTIYA hinted, because Uralmash is no ordinary enterprise: It has produced members of the government and even its chairman. "Ordinary" enterprises find it harder to exist.

Well aware that perestroyka hinges on the system of planning, producers have been taken aback at not finding the promised radical changes in Article 10 of the Law on State Enterprises: It is pure bureaucratic legerdemain. Target figures "are not directive in character", but if they turn into a state order they "must be included in the plan". In the plan—poor logic!—which is "independently" approved by the enterprise. And state orders cover practically all of the enterprise's production capacities. State orders "can be allocated on a competitive basis", that is, they may be so advantageous economically that enterprises will fight for them. But this "can be" does not bind the higher body: "can be" doesn't mean "will be". The law declares that "in placing state orders provision must be made for the mutual responsibility of the sides—the executor and the contractor". The enterprise might be able to squeeze something out of this provision, but nowhere does it say that a state order which has no material technical support and is economically disadvantageous for the enterprise is not binding. Without this, however, switching from predominantly administrative to predominantly economic methods of management will remain wishful thinking.

The Draft Law on Cooperatives in the USSR, now under discussion, is an improvement over the Law on State Enterprise. Article 16 provides for the cooperatives' full and real independence concerning plans: The plan is drawn up on the basis of concluded agreements and approved by the general meeting. Unfortunately, collective farms are a "special case". They conclude contracts with procurement organizations and processing enterprises "on the basis" of the state orders handed down to them. In defiance of the principle of cooperative independence, this meaningful "on the basis" retains-in concealed and bashful form-directive planning and administrative management for the collective farms as well as for state enterprises. By hook or by crook.

Besides "individual entrepreneurs", we now have two categories of enterprises which enjoy independence in planning: the "new cooperatives", which have no (for the time being?) administrative apparatus, and joint ventures (with foreign firms) which have escaped excessive administrative control by dint of their "emancipating" alliance. That they are free from directive planning is both natural and correct. But what do we get? The economy's main forces—the state sector and the collective farms—have found themselves on the fringes of economic democratization. Radical changes have extended to few and insignificant enterprises. Together with planning independence they have been given great organizational advantages vis-a-vis state enterprises and collective farms and thus the opportunity to profit off the flaws in our economic mechanism. This situation doesn't square with the interests of society and the nature of the socialist state.

How did we wind up with this Law on State Enterprise? The political concept was excellent: create a law of predominantly direct action (as free as possible of resolutions and instructions). This law would make it possible—by bypassing the hide-bound and self-interested bureaucratic apparatus—to turn to the main forces of perestroyka—the work collectives of enterprises—to organize their initiative and put pressure on conservative, inert bureaucrats. But we haven't managed to realize this idea in full.

The Law was drafted the usual way by the apparatus and scholars accustomed to serving it. Others were skilfully kept out (I know because I was among those who knocked in vain on the fortress gates with their drafts and proposals). The concept of the law was not strictly established. As a result, we got a Law, which is generally acceptable in principle, but vague and conservative in fact. The advanced forces have gained some ground, but the bureaucratic apparatus and its conservative members, though not so self-assured, are still the masters of the situation.

A fundamental revolution, the founders of Marxism-Leninism believed, mercilessly criticizes itself, returns to what hasn't been done satisfactorily, and rectifies any mistakes of omissions. Perestroyka is, strictly speaking, a deep-going, radical reform, but it hasn't been called a revolutionary reform for nothing. Perestroyka is not inclined to praise itself when self-criticism would be more appropriate.

It is clear that the initially modest possibilities of the Law on State Enterprise will soon be exhausted altogether. We need to think about a new Law on State Enterprise. It would be good if the 19th party conference passed a decision to draw up a new law.

It would be better to entrust this responsible job not to the bureaucratic apparatus but to the people's legislative representatives—the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, its standing commissions and its presidium. They could broadly rely on science, on the enterprises, on Uralmash and people promoted from among its ranks, and on forward-looking workers of the managerial apparatus, of whom, despite everything, there are quite a few.

Briefs

Siberian Oil Output

More and more oilfields have been opened in west Siberia. Two newly discovered deposits have begun to be developed, six others are being prepared for operation. A major fuel base has been created in this major Soviet region. After a period of stagnation the country's oil industry is on the rise again, thanks to advanced technology and the accelerated development of the new oilfields. Last year west Siberia produced more than a half of the country's oil output. [Text] [*LD1005020588 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 9 May 88*]

Scientific

Further on Activities Aboard 'Mir' Complex

LD1005102388 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT 10 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—TASS correspondent reports from the Mission Control Centre:

The work of Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov on board the orbital complex Mir goes on.

In recent days geophysical research figured prominently on the program of the flight. The cosmonauts carried out a large amount of photography and visual observations of the territory of the Soviet Union. The work is done on assignments from specialists of various branches of the economy with a view to studying the state and seasonal development of vegetation, gathering information necessary in prospecting for minerals as well as for an estimate of the ecological situation in the areas of intensive industrial activity.

Planned for today is a regular series of surveying the territory of our country, specifically, the forests of the Carpathians and the Caucasus, agricultural lands of Odessa region, Krasnodar territory, and Turkmenia.

Astrophysical experiments with the use of the instrumentation of Kvant module are continued. On May 9 the telescopes of the orbital observatory Roentgen were aimed at the Swan [Cygnus] X-1 X-ray source. Today by means of the Glazar ultra-violet telescope the cosmonauts survey individual areas of Virgo constellation.

According to telemetry data and crew reports, the flight of the manned orbital complex Mir is proceeding normally.

Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are feeling well.

Photographs Taken

OW0805033788 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Under a clear, cloudless sky stretching for thousands of miles, Soviet cosmonauts flying aboard the spaceship Mir took photographs of the mountainous region of (Waigaojiasuo). Titov and Manarov took photographs of Lake (Saiwa) and other lakes, forests along the slopes, vegetable plots, and cotton fields. These photographs will help experts to understand the daily conditions of (Waigaojiasuo's) ecological conditions, reservoirs, landscapes, and farmland. Titov and Manarov have been flying on board Mir for over 4 months. Earlier, they had taken photographs of virgin forests in the Far East, (Ertai) mountains, and (Sahake) grassland.

Progress Recorded on Cold Nuclear Fusion

PM0905093188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by I. Novodvorskiy under the rubric "Discoveries Today": "Without Solar Temperatures"]

[Text] On 28 April 1988, the State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries registered a discovery made at the Joint Institute of Nuclear Research by V. Dzhelepov and S. Gershtein, corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences; P. Yermolov, doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences; and E. Vesman amd V. Filchenkov, candidates of Physical and Mathematical Sciences.

The nuclear fusion reaction between hydrogen atoms and its isotopes of deuterium and tritium is exceedingly important for the whole of mankind. Uncurbed—in hundreds and thousands of warheads—it instills understandable horror in people; on its controlled form, the people of the world rightly pin hopes of a better future, of energy sufficiency for our civilization.

For many years phsyicists have been wrestling with the problem of curbing the capricious ways of nuclear fusion. To obtain energy, you first have to expend it to bring the atomic nuclei together. So plasma is heated up to a temperature of hundreds and millions of degrees using ultrapowerful magnetic fields, lasers, and elementary particle beams. There have been successes, but victory is not yet near.

Far less familiar is another potential route: so-called cold nuclear fusion. In this case muons—elementary particles, charged, like electrons, but 200 times heavier—are used as the nuclear reaction catalyst. Here too, first of all, you need an energy input: A powerful accelerator is used as a muon generator. The muons bombard the hydrogen and its isotopes and form muon atoms. (Instead of an electron, they have a muon revolving around the nucleus). Because of the muon's large mass, these atoms are 200 times smaller; therefore, in molecules of muon hydrogen, deuterium, and tritium, the nuclei are at the small distance apart that is necessary for the fusion reaction. After fusion, the muons are released and form new muon atoms and molecules, and the process is repeated over again.

Physicists in Dubna have discovered that with deuterium at a particular temperature, near room temperature, and with a pressure of only around 40 atmospheres, the speed of formation of muon molecules and, consequently, the number of fusion reactions sharply increases, and, in its short lifetime, the muon is able to do a lot. As research in our country and abroad has subsequently demonstrated, this phenomenon is even more strikingly manifested in a mixture of deuterium and tritium in specific proportions. In this case, one muon is capable of causing more than 150 fusion reactions. This does not yet entirely justify the expenditure of energy on its production, but it does hold out the prospect of cold nuclear fusion.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Mathematician

PM0605111288 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 88 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary: "Academician Lev Semenovich Pontryagin"]

[Excerpts] Soviet science has suffered a grave loss. Hero of Socialist Labor, Academician Lev Semenovich Pontryagin, the outstanding Soviet scientist and mathematician, sector chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences V.A. Steklov Mathematics Institute, died on 3 May 1988 in his 80th year. [passage omitted]

V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, A.N. Yakovlev, G.I. Marchuk, V.A. Grigoryev, G.A. Yagodin, V.A. Kotelnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, Ye.P. Velikhov, A.A. Logunov, K.V. Frolov, A.L. Yanshin, I.M. Makarov, N.G. Basov, N.N. Bogolyubov, V.S. Vladimirov, I.M. Gelfand, A.A. Gonchar, N.N. Krasovskiy, M.M. Lavrentyev, V.A. Melnikov, Yu.A. Mitropolskiy, Ye.F. Mishchenko, S.M. Nikolskiy, S.P. Novikov, V.P. Platonov, A.V. Pogorelov, Yu.V. Prokhorov, L.I. Sedov, S.L. Sobolev, A.N. Tikhonov, L.D. Faddeyev, R.V. Gamkrelidze.

Briefs

Solar Power Station

The first commercial high-capacity solar power station in the Soviet Union will be built in Central Asia. The technical and economic evidence for it has been submitted to experts for their judgment. The border region between the Karakum desert and the oasis in Khorezm Oblast near the town of Druzhba has been chosen for the station. Its design capacity is 300,000 kw. More than 5,500 mirrors will be directed to the sun. Electronic equipment will direct these mirrors throughout the day to the sun. [Summary] [*LD1005014388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 9 May 88*]

Antarctic Activities

As has been reported, the "Akademik Fedorov" and "Mikhail Somov" have reached the shores of South America after leaving the Antarctic. After visiting ports in Argentina and Uruguay, they will set course for home. Winter is soon to set in in Antarctica. The "Mikhail Somov" had a hard time of it this year during transport operations near the Novolazarevskaya base. GDR specialists were among those dropped at Novolazarevskaya and Bellingshausen bases, and 1,500 tonnes of cargo were delivered including equipment, fuel, food, tractors, and aerodrome equipment. Bulgarian scientists were also aboard the "Mikhail Somov," and in conjunction with their Soviet colleagues, they were to seek out a site for Bulgaria's first scientific base. The "Mikhail Somov" reached the South Shetland Islands, and there, on the island bearing the name of the old Russian town of Smolensk, the expedition landed and laid the foundations for Bulgaria's first Antarctic station. [Summary]

[LD0505013588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2100 GMT 4 May 88]

Military

Events, Articles Celebrate 43d Victory Day

Minute of Silence Observed

LD0905152988 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 9 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 9 TASS—Today at 19.00 Moscow time the Soviet people observed a minute of silence in the memory of those who died in the struggle against fascism in the years of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945.

The eternal fire on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall appeared on Soviet television screens. A voice off screen said: "Today, as in previous years, we are paying homage to those who did not return from the war which claimed the lives of 20 million Soviet people. There is not a family in the Soviet Union which did not lose a father or a brother, a son or a mother, a daughter or a sister. There is not a single home which did not know sorrow during the war. Decades have passed but the pain of loss has not subsided in our hearts. And we feel the same enormous gratitude to those who got killed on the battlefields. We will always remember our heroes."

The same text was read on Soviet radio.

Solovyev Attends Ceremony

LD0905171188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 9 May 88

[Excerpt] At the Piskarevskoye memorial cemetery, a solemn mourning ceremony was held marking the 43d victory anniversary. Thousands of Leningraders and army and naval servicemen came to the fraternal graves. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom took part in the ceremony. [passage omitted]

Shcherbitskiy Lays Wreath

LD0905163588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 May 88

[Excerpts] Victory Day is being marked in our country. [passage omitted] Comrade Shcherbitskiy took part in the wreath laying ceremony in Kiev. [passage omitted]

Yazov on Legacy of War

PM0905104088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 88 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Army General D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR defense minister: "Feat for the Sake of Life"]

[Text] I.

Our country is marking the nationwide holiday, the 43d anniversary of the historic victory in the Great Patriotic War, in an atmosphere of constructive work in the revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society and the implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress course of renewal and acceleration of socioeconomic development. The new moral and political atmosphere created by the party is characterized by a high level of patriotic enthusiasm and the desire of Soviet people to fulfill the plans outlined and preserve the peace whose foundations were laid by the victorious May 1945.

Less than one-quarter of a century—that was the age of the Soviet state when the aggressor's perfidious attack interrupted our socialist building. For a significant proportion of that time we had had to live and work in the conditions of the growing danger of war. The Communist Party and Soviet Government did everything possible to create a system of collective security and avert the war that was ripening within imperialism. But the Soviet proposals did not meet with the support of the Western powers, which sought to set fascism and socialism against each other and channeled the main currents of aggression against the USSR. That confronted the party and the Soviet people with the necessity, while continuing socialist building, to strengthen the country's defense capability, increase the combat readiness of the Armed Forces, and educate Soviet people in a spirit of vigilance and readiness to defend the socialist fatherland.

When the enemy perfidiously attacked us, the whole country rose as one man in the Great Patriotic War—a war for its freedom and independence, for the socialist choice it had made once and for all, for the right to live and work under the motherland's peaceful sky, for the motherland's future. The Leninist Communist Party mobilized the economic, military, and spiritual potential of the Soviet state to rout the aggressor. It inspired the people to achieve that goal, fused with the people, became a fighting party, headed the struggle at the front and in the rear, and led the country to victory.

Victory in the Great Patriotic War was a logical victory for the working people's state born in October, the most advanced social system, and the socialist economy. It was a victory for the indissoluble union of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and Soviet intelligentsia and the fraternal unity and friendship of all the peoples of our multinational motherland. It was a victory for Soviet people's ardent patriotism and internationalism, for socialist ideology, which took possession of the people's masses in our country and became a mighty material force. It was a victory for Soviet military science and military art, for our new type of army, which proved on the cruel battlefields its indisputable superiority over the strongest capitalist army of the day.

Our Great Victory was won by the unprecedented staunchness, courage, and heroism of Soviet servicemen on the battlefield, the selfless struggle of partisans and underground fighters beyond the front line, and the devoted feat of working people in the rear. It confirmed that the people are the real makers of history, that the decisive role in history belongs to the human factor. Soviet people were inspired by their unshakable conviction that they were fighting for a just cause, for their children and grandchildren to live in peace and happiness.

Our people paid a high price for victory—20 million of its sons' and daughters' lives. The fascists destroyed and burned 1,710 of our cities and settlements, entirely or partially destroyed some 32,000 industrial enterprises, and ruined 98,000 kolkhozes and 1,876 sovkhozes. Nearly 25 million people were left without shelter. The war took away forever nearly one-third of our country's national wealth...

It was an immensely tough, mortal struggle against a strong, merciless, cruel enemy. Our country was attacked in a perfidious strike by an invasion army 5.5-million strong, an army that was mobilized in good time, that was comprehensively equipped, and that could draw on the military and economic potential and resources of fascist Germany, its satellites, and the occupied European countries. The situation that developed on the various sectors of the vast front that stretched from the Arctic Circle to the Black Sea was varied, complex, and sometimes dramatic. The beginning of the war was terrible for us. We knew the grief of the first failures and defeats, the bitterness of retreat. But always, even in the most complex and at times hopeless situation, we fought to the end and believed in victory. And it came. The aggressor met his inglorious end on our soil, the land he had intended to conquer, and suffered crushing defeat at the hands of our people, who would not be subdued.

The feat accomplished by the Soviet people and their servicemen in the Great Patriotic War is not limited by time. From the vantage point of today we can see still more clearly its magnitude, its tremendous significance for our present and future. This places all the more responsibility on the shoulders of those who, in response to the greatly increased public interest in our motherland's history, turn to the events of the military past, to its chapters, including the little-known chapters. Here, perhaps more than anywhere else, what is important is a high sense of civic responsibility, an accurate and clear position of truth, as was taught by the 27th CPSU Congress, and superficiality or a lack of objectivity are impermissible. Everything associated with the military and labor feat of the last war is worthy of the most solicitous attitude, the deepest respect and gratitude.

In dealing with the heroic and difficult time of war, we never forget that we were not alone in the battle against the aggressor. The peoples of the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition, the Resistance movement, partisans and underground fighters, and all those who fought against fascism and militarism were involved. At the same time it is a matter of legitimate pride for us that it was our country, our Armed Forces that played the decisive role in the defeat of fascism. Only the Soviet people were able to stop the hordes of fascist barbarians and bleed them dry. On the Soviet-German front the enemy sustained more than 70 percent of all its losses and sustained defeats in battles that determined the course and outcome of World War II. We are proud of the generation of Soviet people who went down in history forever as the generation of the Great Patriotic War. We remember and are proud of all who stood at their posts unto death, sheltering with their own bodies every inch of their native land, who went into the attack under a hail of bullets, who met the enemy in hand-to-hand fighting, who annihilated him on land, in the air, and at sea, who bore aloft the honor and dignity of Soviet man through the fascist torture chambers, who forged the weapons of victory at the machine tools and furnaces, extracted oil and coal, and grew grain.

A feeling of patriotic pride is a lofty, joyful, bright feeling. At the same time it is a feeling that imposes obligations. It is inseparable from responsibility to the memory of the fallen and to the generations living now and future generations for the preservation of the most valuable thing the victory brought us—the opportunity to live and work in conditions of peace. For 43 years there has been a peaceful sky above our country. That is not a gift of fate, but the result of our people's staunch labor. We have managed to defend the fruits of victory despite the intentions of imperialist reaction to revise the results of the war. Despite the gloomy predictions of our enemies, in a matter of years we dealt with the consequences of the war, took our motherland to new heights in economic and social development, and ensured that its defense capability was at the necessary level. All this robbed imperialism of its hopes of winning the "cold war" it imposed, set up a firm barrier to its ideology and the policy of "rolling back socialism," forced it to moderate its claims to world domination, and prevented it from pushing mankind into the abyss of nuclear war.

Everything we have today was largely predetermined by our victory and shines with its unfading light. Every new success in the struggle to strengthen international security and preserve peace is also associated with the victory. Among the many lessons for our present and future that the victory gave mankind, there is one in which the germs of today's new political thinking can clearly be perceived. It is that in the face of fascist slavery, an alliance of capitalist states with the country of socialism became possible. The atmosphere of cooperation among the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition and the realistic understanding of the new situation that had emerged after the defeat of fascism were reflected in the postwar settlement, which met the interests of peace.

Through the fault of Western reactionary circles, the experience of cooperation was consigned to oblivion. But today, with mankind facing the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the value of that experience is becoming ever more apparent to everyone. Today it is not only possible, but necessary to pool the efforts of all states for the sake of resolving the common task of eliminating that threat, and essentially for the sake of life.

II.

The new political thinking represents the party's creative development of the Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence at the present stage. Expressed in our party's foreign policy, the new thinking is aimed at radically changing the traditional ideas about war and peace. We proceed on the basis that nuclear war cannot be the means of achieving any political, economic, or ideological goals whatsoever. It is senseless, since in such a war there could be neither victors nor vanquished. Its inevitable outcome would be the destruction of all living things.

The reality of the nuclear and space age is such that security cannot now be ensured solely by military means—neither by "deterrence," nor by the use of weapons, nor by the constant improvement of offensive and defensive weapon systems. Hence the futility of the striving for military superiority and the ever greater dangers of the arms race—whether on earth or in space—for the cause of peace. True security is equal security, common to all states. There is only one way to achieve that—political solutions to problems. The really reliable way to guarantee it is a military-strategic balance at an ever lower level, a balance from which nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction should be entirely excluded.

The opportunities opening up along the path of the joint, constructive resolution of the most complex problems of today are demonstrated by the Soviet-American dialogue at the highest level, in which the meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington were milestones. To its credit is that achievement of historic importance, the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and American Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Major steps along the disarmament path would be a Soviet-U.S. agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms together with strict compliance with the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, an international convention on the universal banning and elimination of chemical weapons, and an accord on a radical reduction in armed forces and armaments in Europe—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

A weighty confirmation of the possibility and necessity of resolving complex international problems by political means was the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. The political settlement of the Afghan problem could serve as a model for the elimination of regional conflicts in other parts of the world. Under the Pentagon's classification, such conflicts are called "low-intensity" wars. But it is only necessary to recall that in the time since World War II some 17 million people have died in such wars to form an idea of what lies behind this deceptively reassuring term. It is necessary to reckon with the fact that, as historical experience shows, such conflicts are fraught with the danger of the spread of hostilities to other regions. They could be the direct or indirect cause of a new world war.

Socialism unreservedly rejects war as a means of resolving interstate political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes. Our ideal is a world without weapons or violence, a world in which each people freely chooses its path of development, its way of life. Our peace-loving intentions and our will for peace are enshrined in the CPSU Program, the USSR Constitution, the nuclear disarmament program set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 Statement, the proposals on creating a comprehensive system of international peace and security put forward by the Soviet Union together with other socialist countries at the United Nations, the Delhi Declaration, and other documents and official speeches by our country's leadership figures.

While fighting consistently and firmly for the strengthening of peace and international security and for disarmament, we have no right to close our eyes to the fact that in the leading capitalist states influential reactionary circles are repositories of the spirit of militarism. They ignore present-day political realities. Their ideology and policy and their activity are characterized by bellicosity and even adventurism, and are the source of the military threat spearheaded against the USSR and its allies.

A negative factor in international relations is the adherence of certain circles in the West to "cold war" stereotypes and their reluctance to contemplate the futility of a policy of strength regarding the Soviet Union and the futility of attempts to "pressure the Soviets" and achieve military superiority over us. As for the USSR, we do not seek such superiority, but nor do we acknowledge that anyone else has that right. We will never forgo our own security or the security of our allies and friends.

Naturally, we cannot disregard attempts by certain NATO leaders, making use of the "enemy image," to intimidate their country's public with the imaginary threat from the USSR and the Warsaw Pact and achieve military superiority over us by means of "compensating" for the Pershing-2 and land-based cruise missiles that are due for destruction by building up other arms. While recognizing the necessity for conventional arms reduction and the elimination of imbalances, they stubbornly refuse to renounce the dogmas of "nuclear deterrence."

We cannot fail to take all this into account. We have thoroughly mastered the lessons of the last war and drawn the necessary conclusions from them. Aware of our responsibility for the future of our motherland, socialism, and peace, we have done and will do everything necessary to maintain the high vigilance and appropriate level of combat readiness of the Armed Forces and to reliably ensure the peaceful life and work of Soviet people.

III.

The sons and grandsons of the servicemen who won victory serve in the combat formation of the Soviet Armed Forces today. They serve beneath the combat banners of guards formations and units and those that bear orders and honorary titles, and they worthily continue and augment the heroic traditions of the frontline men.

Of course, the weapons and hardware now in the armory of the Army and Navy and their means of application differ from those that existed during the years of the Great Patriotic War. But it is people who control hardware. It is their will, energy, and skill that ensure the strengthening of the Armed Forces' combat potential and the steady enhancement of the combat readiness of troops and naval forces. And although the servicemen of the eighties have naturally progressed far in education and level of technical and general development, in the most important thing, in what determines their spiritual makeup, they resemble their fathers and grandfathers. This resemblance lies in their unshakable loyalty to the military oath, military duty, and their socialist motherland.

Our army has always drawn strength from the continuity of generations. It is only natural that in the constellation of Heroes of the Soviet Union, alongside Aleksandr Matrosov, Yuriy Smirnov, Nikolay Gastello, Viktor Talalikhin, and other servicemen of the Great Patriotic War, servicemen of our own day take a worthy place—Nikolay Anfinogenov, Vyacheslav Gaynutdinov, Grigoriy Demchenko, Aleksandr Koryavin... The baton of the feat, the feat that is immortal by its very nature, because it was and is accomplished, as the poet said, "not for the sake of glory, for the sake of life on earth," has passed into reliable, strong, and loyal hands.

The demands on the standard of training and combat readiness of the Armed Forces arise from the defensive thrust of Soviet military doctrine. That standard must be such that nobody can catch us unawares, it must ensure the capability of troops and naval forces to repel aggression and guarantee the reliable defense of the socialist fatherland.

The system of training of the USSR Armed Forces and the instruction and education of personnel is built in accordance with the main political task to which Soviet military doctrine is geared—the task of preventing war. We see all questions of rebuffing aggression solely from the standpoint of retaliatory actions. Both in the provision of equipment for troops and naval forces and in military building in general, we proceed on the basis of the principles of equilibrium and defense sufficiency.

Army and Navy personnel wholly and entirely approve the foreign policy course of the Communist Party and Soviet Government and the practical tasks of arms reduction and the further lowering of the level of military confrontation in the context of mutual and equal security for the sides at all stages of disarmament. Of course, command and political cadres and all Soviet servicemen are well aware that quantitative arms reductions demand a further improvement in the level of combat readiness, organization, and discipline and increase the responsibility of every serviceman for the full, precise fulfillment of the duties entrusted to him and for the state of affairs in his subunit or unit or on his ship.

The increasingly profound restructuring of the entire life and activity of personnel promotes the resolution of the tasks facing the Armed Forces. The main avenues of the restructuring are improving the quality of training of troops and naval forces, establishing regulation order everywhere, and strengthening organization and discipline. In the course of restructuring commanding officers, political organs, and party and Komsomol organizations seek to combine organically a high level of exactingness and strict demands concerning the state of affairs in the sector in question with concern for people and for the satisfaction of their needs and aspirations and the energetic, practical resolution of problems in the social sphere.

The attainment of the goals of restructuring is actively promoted by the democratization of Army and Navy life, the widening of glasnost in military collectives, and the creation of a sound moral and psychological atmosphere in every unit and on every ship. Personnel are becoming more and more widely involved in the struggle to eliminate stagnation phenomena and shortcomings and in the joint creative, enterprising resolution of day-to-day tasks. The upsurge in political and practical activeness among servicemen is indicated by the socialist competition launched in the Army and Navy to greet the 19th all-union party conference in a fitting manner.

The interests of the country's defense and the improvement of the Armed Forces' combat readiness require restructuring also in the sphere of the preparation of young people for military service and their military-patriotic education. It is important to teach the young generation about the heroism of the Great Patriotic War and to cultivate in them a profound respect for military labor and readiness worthily to fulfill their military duty and defend the fatherland.

Together with all the people, Soviet servicemen are taking part in the implementation of the party's course of revolutionary renewal of society. They are greeting the victory holiday with the growth of combat skill and field, air, and naval expertise, the strengthening of discipline, and the improvement of the combat readiness of units and ships. For Soviet servicemen a living, inspiring example of selfless fulfillment of patriotic and international duty and devoted service to the people will always be seen in the feat of the heroes who won the victory in the Great Patriotic War—a feat for the sake of the motherland, for the sake of life.

Kulikov on War's Lessons

LD0905103588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 May 88 First Edition p 1

["Our Dialogue" interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR First Deputy Defense Minister and Commander in chief of Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, by unidentified interviewer: "Responsibility for Peace"; date and place not given]

[Text] [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] Viktor Georgiyevich, it is now 43 years since the last day of the Great Patriotic War. Yet the Soviet people's memory is becoming keener and is turning increasingly often to events of the unforgettable war years....

[Kulikov] Yes, the Great Patriotic War is one of those events in our country's history whose memory does not fade with the passage of time. As a matter of fact, this memory is becoming stronger and more vivid. And this memory lives not only within us frontline soldiers; it can be said without any exaggeration that there are thousands of invisible but lasting threads linking every Soviet person with the last war.

Chronologically 9 May 1945 marked the beginning of the great victory. This victory testified to the supreme vital strength of the Soviet people, to their boundless love for the motherland and their unwavering loyalty to the cause of October. The Great Patriotic war sharpened to an exceptional degree the whole people's sense of historical responsibility for the defense of socialism in the USSR. This sense is alive to this day, as is testified by the revolutionary restructuring. Those who are marching in its vanguard have learned and are still learning from the hero frontline soldiers courage, an uncompromising attitude in struggle, and the ability to withstand until the end, until victory.

The victory in the Great Patriotic War proved the high standard of Soviet military science. The Armed Forces brilliantly executed more than 50 strategic and over 250 front operations, numerous army operations, and thousands of battles. They displayed to the utmost the talent of Soviet marshals, generals, and officers and the heroism of the Soviet soldier.

Behind all this lies the titanic work by the party, which became a truly fighting party at that time.

To sum up, the victory is fated never to recede into the past. It was and it still is; it is part of our present, of our cohesion in the struggle for the cause of Lenin and of the party.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] You fought in the war from the very first to the very last day. What are your feelings on Victory Day as a frontline soldier?

[Kulikov] There is no unambiguous answer to this. The feelings are most diverse. Of course, the main one is a feeling of pride. Pride for the fact that it was the Soviet people, our Armed Forces which made the decisive contribution to the routing of fascism.

Our victory was not easy to gain. The war took the lives of many millions of Soviet people. It is therefore natural that the feeling of pride should be accompanied by sorrow. Sorrow for those who died, for those who, by their death, affirmed man's supreme rights—the right to live, the right to independent statehood, peace, and happiness. Not only for their country and their own people, but also for the whole of Europe, for the whole planet.

Of course, on Victory Day memory prompts reminiscences of episodes from frontline life. The main one for me goes back to 22 June 1941, my first battle with the 41st Tank Division of the Southwest Front. The outcome of this battle was that the enemy was not only halted but actually pushed back some 4-6 km from our positions. Even though we were later forced to retreat, every single soldier and commander was convinced: Come what may, the enemy would be crushed and victory would be ours.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] Our editorial office receives quite a few letters whose writers share their reminiscences about the war and their reflections about the complex and crucial fate of today's world. They are all unanimous that a new war must not be allowed. In this context one would ask: What is today's role of the Soviet Armed Forces as a factor of peace and security for the peoples?

[Kulikov] The Soviet Union and the other socialist community states are convinced that it is possible to defend peace and prevent war. What is needed are decisive actions against the arms race and genuine disarmament. This is the objective of the entire foreign policy activity of the party and the state. The signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles was one of its major and fundamentally important achievements. The Soviet leadership's new thinking and new approaches to questions of war and peace in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington have become a real material force in the struggle for peace and security on earth.

At the same time, let us neither forget nor close our eyes to the fact that certain forces in the West are continuing their preparations for war. The most tangible proof of this can be seen in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative."

To preserve peace and prevent war, the Soviet Union, together with its allies, is forced to strengthen the combat readiness of the Armed Forces in parallel with major political measures. Possessed of great combat might, they check the aggressive aspirations of imperialist reaction.

At the same time it is necessary to emphasize the strictly defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine. It is based on the firm belief held by our people and our party that war is unacceptable as a means for resolving interstate contradictions, and is subordinated to the task of preventing war, be it nuclear or conventional. But the USSR Armed Forces will defend with total determination all that has been gained and created by the Soviet people.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] Today's Army and Navy servicemen are the sons and grandsons of the frontline soldiers. What are they like, in your view? Do they fully share those qualities which distinguish people of your generation, people who carried the burden of such a war?

[Kulikov] It was said from the 27th CPSU Congress rostrum that Soviet servicemen worthily perform their duty in the most complex and at times grim conditions. For my part I would add this: Today's defenders of the country are confidently augmenting the combat traditions they have inherited from their fathers and grandfathers. I would like to list among these traditions primarily wholehearted devotion to the cause of the party, love for the motherland, and staunchness, courage, and valor in performing any tasks in defending the socialist fatherland. Loyalty to international duty ranks equal with these.

The following figures also describe the contemporary army. Almost 80 percent of drafted servicemen have higher or secondary education. Some 70 percent of officers have higher military or specialized military education. Communists and Komsomol member account for 90 percent of officers.

At the same time, I cannot fail to mention the unfortunate fact that individual negative occurrences can be encountered in the army environment. For example, some servicemen—to use the accepted phrase—come into conflict with regulation demands and display no particular diligence in mastering their military specialized field. All this is the consequence of shortcomings both within the army and in the organization of military-patriotic work with the population and of predraft training of young people.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] It is well known that the combat alliance of the peoples and armies of Europe's socialist states emerged and strengthened in joint battles against fascism, and they allied themselves within the Warsaw Pact Organization 14 May 1955. How do you assess the role, importance, and main results of the activity of this defensive alliance of fraternal countries? I ask you this since you are USSR first deputy defense minister and at the same time commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of Warsaw Pact states.

[Kulikov] The creation of the Warsaw Pact organization was a step which the European socialist states were forced to take to ensure the reliable defense of their peoples' revolutionary gains. It would not go amiss to recall that it was taken in response to the military threat posed to their security by the United States and the NATO bloc in the late forties and early fifties.

The time that has passed since then has convincingly confirmed the good timing of the signing of the Warsaw Pact. The joint efforts ensured the fraternal countries' security and thwarted imperialism's attempts to involve the peoples in a new war.

The document "On the Warsaw Pact States' Military Doctrine," the anniversary of whose adoption also falls in May, is exceptionally important in this context. This doctrine organically fuses the allied socialist countries' love for peace and their desire to do everything possible to prevent war with their readiness to reliably protect themselves against any outside attack. The doctrine's content has a strictly defensive orientation. In view of this, the fraternal states have no need to possess a military potential of a size in excess of defense requirements or of the limits of sufficiency to repulse aggression. But we will not allow any violations of the prevailing military-strategic parity, either.

These limits are set not by us but by the United States and NATO. Therefore, for as long as they possess powerful armed forces and modern arms, including nuclear arms, for as long as the threat of war remains, the allied socialist countries are forced to maintain their armed forces in a configuration and at a level guaranteeing reliable defense against any aggression.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] In your opinion, Viktor Georgiyevich, what is the essence of the war's lessons for our time? What do they teach us?

[Kulikov] Primarily the fact that the struggle against war must be waged before war starts, before missiles are launched, before bombs start falling and shells start exploding.

In struggling for peace and against the threat of a new war it is necessary to be clearly aware of its source. This source is international imperialist reaction, which was also the main culprit of World War II.

In this context the most topical lesson of the last war is the demand for utmost vigilance toward the aggressive schemes and intrigues by world reaction.

But the enhancement of vigilance is just one part of a dual task. Its second part is to protect and augment by all means the gains of socialism and to strengthen the country's economic and defense might. The greater this might is, the stronger will be the barrier blocking the path of those living in dreams of social revenge.

Akhromeyev Reviews Conflict

LD0805133588 Moscow International Service in Czech 1700 GMT 6 May 88

[Text] On 9 May the Soviet people and the nations of many countries of the world celebrate Victory Day—the 43d anniversary of the victory over fascist Germany. The same fate was soon to befall militaristic Japan too, and thus World War II, which claimed more than 50 million human lives, came to an end.

A Moscow Radio correspondent has met with Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, who left for the front as an 18-year-old. Toward the end of the war he became a battalion commander, and subsequently held senior staff and command posts. He has received a number of military honors, and is a hero of the Soviet Union. For 3 of the 4 years of war, the Soviet Union fought alone, for the most part, against the Hitlerite hordes, Marshal Akhromeyev said. It was on the Soviet-German front which, at certain stages, stretched for 6,000 kilometers that the main battles of World War II took place; it was there that the Wehrmacht forces sustained the decisive losses. Soviet troops defeated 607 fascist divisions, which accounted for two-thirds of all the combat aircraft, tanks and artillery of fascist Germany and its allies. The human losses suffered by the Hitlerite army on the eastern front were four times greater than their losses on all the other fronts. Let me cite the words of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt who, on 6 May 1942, said: From the point of view of overall strategy it is difficult to overlook the evident fact that the Russian armies are destroying more enemy troops and equipment than all the other 25 states in the allied coalition put together.

Victory in the war was achieved through the concerted efforts of many countries and nations, Marshal Akhromeyev continued. The partisan armies of Yugoslavia, the armies of Czechoslovakia and Poland which came into being on Soviet territory and, in the final stage, the armies of Bulgaria and Romania and combat units from Hungary and Albania fought heroically against the enemy. An important contribution to the common victory was also made by members of resistance and underground anti-fascist movements, by the best sons and daughters of all the states occupied by the enemy, also by German anti-fascists. Unforgettable too is the combat heroism of the nations and armies of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and China. We appreciate the bravery of the U.S., British, French, and Chinese troops, and the skill of their commanders. Although the United States and Great Britain opened up a second front in Western Europe as late as 1944, even then that fact was highly important from the political and military-strategic points of view. As a result of the massive coordinated attacks from the east and west, Hitlerite Germany was squeezed in a pincer grip and had to capitulate. These concerted onslaughts also heralded the subsequent capitulation of militaristic Japan. We appreciate the assistance in terms of weapons, ammunition and materials which the United States and Great Britain sent to us during the war.

Our joint victory confirmed that cooperation can exist between states with different social systems and convincingly showed that differences in ideology and social systems do not preclude the existence of common interests in the fight against the common enemy, against the common danger to save human civilization. This is something which must be borne in mind particularly in the current nuclear and space age, when mankind is threatened by the lethal danger of nuclear extermination.

The Soviet Union, Marshal Akhromeyev continued, proceeds from the premise that in the nuclear and space century, war is an anachronism. The type of thinking and action based on the concept of force is unacceptable. It is pointless to try to build national—let alone international—security on the arms race, fear, and doctrines of deterrence and intimidation. Ensuring security is becoming increasingly a political task, and it can and must be tackled solely by political means. The Soviet Union and all the Warsaw Treaty states are against competition in building up arms. We call on all countries to rid themselves of the mutual suspicion that has built up over many years. Our military doctrine is strictly defensive: All the Warsaw Treaty states have unequivocally stated that never, under any circumstances, will they initiate military action against any state as long as they themselves do not become the target of armed attack; they will never be the first to use nuclear weapons; they make no claims on the territory of any other state; they do not adopt a hostile attitude to any nation or state; they are willing to build relations with all countries, without exception, on the basis of mutual respect for the interests of security and peaceful coexistence.

Marshal Akhromeyev spoke highly of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Now the world expects further steps in this sphere, stated Marshal Akhromeyev, including the achievement of even more responsible and significant accords, on a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear weapons while adhering to the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, on substantial reductions in armed forces and all types of conventional weapons in Europe. There are great hopes for the next meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in Moscow in late May-early June this year.

In international affairs, Marshall Akhromeyev continued, the Soviet Union takes a level-headed, realistic position. In particular, it adheres to the principle of equality and equal security. The Geneva agreement on Afghanistan and the Soviet Government's decision to pull out the limited contingent of Soviet troops from that country demonstrate once again our goodwill and contributions to the settlement of complicated international problems.

Despite all this, however, it must not be forgotten that the world situation is still complicated. The Western powers are striving relentlessly to extract one-sided concessions from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. A serious danger is NATO's plans to upgrade its armaments and compensate for the classes of missiles that have been scrapped. As long as the danger of war persists, as long as social revanchism remains the axis of the strategy of the West's militaristic programs, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has stated, we will continue to do everything to maintain the country's defensive might at a level that preculdes the military superiority of imperialism over socialism.

Our defense policy, Marshal Akhromeyev emphasized, pursues a single objective: the defense of our homeland and of the other fraternal socialist states against external aggression. Our entire defense pprogram, proceeding from the main demands of Soviet military doctrine, rests on the principles of military balance and necessary defense sufficiency. The training of the Soviet Armed Forces is based exclusively on retaliatory defensive action. It precludes the launch of preemptive strikes, but it provides for an aggression to be resolutely repulsed, if such an aggression is unleashed. We look to the future with the firm conviction that mankind's future lies not in the policy of force, but in the unity of all people and in peace.